THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THE Gospels make it plain that the ministry of Jesus, which was the inauguration of the Kingdom of God, was confined, almost exclusively, to 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel.' Yet, in God's providence, the Gentiles came later to share in its blessings. How and when did Jesus expect the Gentiles to inherit the Kingdom?

This is an old question to which Professor JEREMIAS gives a new answer in his latest book, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*.[1] His argument falls into three parts and is rounded off with a practical conclusion. Let us sketch it.

In Part I he states and argues three negative theses. He starts by stressing what we so readily forget—that the Judaism of our Lord's day was intensely interested in Jewish Foreign Missions. As Paul found, the number of 'God-fearers' was immense. In a world suffering from disillusionment and 'loss of nerve' the faith of Israel attracted many Gentiles, and the Jews, on their part, made every effort to facilitate their passage from paganism. 'Love mankind and bring them to the Law,' said Hillel c. A.D. 20. Yet Jesus, as JEREMIAS points out, in His one recorded utterance on the matter *roundly condemned the Jewish mission*. 'Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you traverse sea and land to make a single proselyte, and when he becomes a proselyte, you make him twice as much a child of hell as yourselves' (Mt 23^{15}). Next, he bids us note that *Jesus, during His life-time, forbade His disciples to preach to non-Jews*: 'Go nowhere among the Gentiles, and enter no town of the Samaritans, but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mt $10^{5f.}$. What a contrast to 'Go therefore and make disciples of all nations' in 28^{19}!). Yes, but what of these sayings of Jesus which clearly imply a mission to the Gentiles (*e.g.*, Mk 13^{10} 14^{9}, Mt $5^{13f.}$)? They are all, replies JEREMIAS, to be understood otherwise. Thus Mk 14^{9} should be exegeted thus: 'When the triumphal news is proclaimed (by God's angel) to all the world, then will her act be remembered (before God), so that He may be gracious to her (at the Last Judgment).' We have an idea that this exegesis will convince few readers, but let us proceed. Passages like Lk 10^{1} and 14^{23} (with its Gentile implications) are then declared secondary, and confirmation that Jesus during His life-time sent His disciples to Israel alone is found in Gal 2^{7} where Peter and James agree that their mission is to the circumcised. In the third place, *Jesus limited His own activity to Israel*: 'I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Mt 15^{24}). Yes, but surely the stories of the Syro-Phoenician Woman and of the Centurion's Servant give the lie to this? JEREMIAS, finding himself here in some difficulty, is content to dismiss these cases as 'exceptions to the rule.'

Some scholars, however, have suggested that this limitation applied only to the first half (the Galilean phase) of Jesus' Ministry and that in the second half it was different. But JEREMIAS will have none of this. The 'northern journey' to the region of Tyre was no Gentile mission, and neither Luke nor Matthew has any evidence to add to Mark's on this issue. Moreover, a German scholar, Albrecht Alt, has shown that Jesus never, in His journeying, went beyond the boundaries of Jewish population—not even when He was in the neighbourhood of Tyre or among the 'villages of Cæsarea Philippi.' Paul's description of Jesus as 'a servant to the circumcised' (Ro 15^{8}) is confirmatory evidence on this point. Only after the Cross and Resurrection was it possible for the Risen Lord to utter His 'Go therefore.' Then God in His mercy no longer limited His grace to

[1] S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net.

Israel, but turned in mercy to the whole Gentile world. So ends Part I.

Having stated his negations, Dr. JEREMIAS now proceeds in Part II to balance them with three positive conclusions.

He reminds us, to begin with, how poor a view the Jews of Jesus' time took of the godless Gentiles and their destiny. 'No Gentile,' opined Rabbi Hyrcanus, 'will have a part in the world to come.' Against this background we should understand the first of the positive conclusions: *Jesus took the idea of vengeance out of the eschatological hope.* Not only did He repeatedly reject Jewish hatred of the Samaritans (then at its bitterest), but we find Him detaching the nationalistic idea of revenge from the hope of redemption. Here the story of the Rejection at Nazareth (Lk $4^{16ff.}$) is given a rather different slant. Whereas the R.S.V. has, 'They wondered at the gracious words that proceeded out of his mouth,' JEREMIAS renders it: 'They were astonished that He spoke of the mercy of God.' Why? Because Jesus, in His quotation from Is $61^{1ff.}$ in the Nazareth synagogue, left out Israel's 'day of vengeance of our God.' Jesus' picture of the future contained no place for such vengeance. Hence, in JEREMIAS's translation, the Jews of Nazareth 'protested with one voice and were furious.' (This surely is to press an unnatural meaning on the Greek!)

Secondly, *Jesus promised the Gentiles a share in salvation.* If Rabbi Hyrcanus said: 'The men of Sodom will *not* rise again,' Jesus pictured them not merely rising but at the Last Judgment condemning the towns which had rejected His disciples. On the great Day, He declared, the men of Nineveh and the Queen of Sheba would rise up to accuse His own generation in Israel. And He said that 'all nations' would finally stand before the Son of man when God made His last reckoning.

Thirdly, *the redeeming work of Jesus included the Gentiles in its saving scope.* Was He not the Son of Man whom 'all peoples, nations and tongues should serve' (Dn 7^{14})? Did He not, at the Triumphal Entry, offer Himself to Jerusalem as the Messiah who should 'speak peace to the nations' and whose dominion should be from sea to sea (Zech 9^{10})? Did He not know Himself to be the Servant of the Lord who should 'bring forth truth to the nations' (Is 42^{1}), become 'a light to the Gentiles' (Is 42^{6}) and die to bear the sins of 'the many' (Is 53^{12})?

So ends Part II. But have we not reached an *impasse*? Our study seems to have landed us in complete contradiction. The gist of Part I was that Jesus limited His activity to Israel; Part II, *per contra*, was devoted to proving that Jesus promised the Gentiles a share in God's Kingdom. In modern parlance, 'where do we go from here?'

It is here that JEREMIAS, following Sundkler of Uppsala, propounds a solution in terms of the Old Testament idea of the pilgrimage of the nations to the Mountain of God, described in Is $2^{2f.}$ (Mic $4^{1f.}$): 'And it shall come to pass in the latter days, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established as the highest of the mountains, and shall be raised above the hills; and all the nations shall flow to it.' Here we have the idea of the eschatological pilgrimage of the Gentiles to the glorified Zion. Did Jesus hold this doctrine? Yes, says JEREMIAS, look at the *logion* preserved in Mt $8^{11f.}$: 'Many will come from east and west and sit at table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, while the sons of the kingdom will be thrown into outer darkness.' When will this great pilgrimage take place? At Judgment Day. This is the event, described in Jesus' story about the Last Judgment, which is presupposed by all His parables and sayings concerning the Messianic Banquet. To this consummation Jesus' sayings about the New Temple belong. When this happens, God's house will be indeed 'a house of prayer for all nations' (Mk 11^{17}), and His word to the Samaritan Woman be fulfilled which prophesies one community worshipping one Father in spirit and in truth (Jn $4^{21ff.}$). Then will 'the birds of the air' (*i.e.* the Gentiles) come flocking to the branches of the full-grown Mustard Tree which is the consummated Kingdom of God. 'Thus,' JEREMIAS concludes, 'we see that the incorporation of the Gentiles in the Kingdom of God, promised by the prophets, was expected and announced by Jesus *as God's eschatological act of power, as the great final manifestation of God's free grace.* For the last time God brings life out of death, creates children to Abraham out of stones, when in the hour of final revelation He summons the nations to Zion, and by constituting the universal people of God from Jews and Gentiles abolished all earthly distinctions.'

But a final, a paramount, question remains: Why should we engage in missions at all, if it is

God's purpose, at the Last Day, by the fiat of omnipotence, to bring the scattered Gentiles into His Kingdom ? This is the answer of JEREMIAS : ' The event of Easter ushered in the dawn of that final Day in which the fulfilment of God's purpose for the nations and for Israel began to take effect. Our missionary task to-day is a part of the final fulfilment. God gives us the chance of co-operating with Him in His gracious anticipation of the decisive hour of redemption promised in Is 25 : the Gentiles accepted at God's Table (*v.* 6), the veil torn from their eyes (*v.* 7), and death abolished for ever (*v.* 8). Thus the special glory of the missionary endeavour lies in the fact that it is a very palpable part of the final consummation inaugurated at Easter.'

So, in seventy-five pages crammed with footnotes and prodigies of rabbinical learning, JEREMIAS produces his solution of the problem of Jesus and the Gentiles. It will not satisfy everybody. Our main criticisms are (1) that in the exegesis of particular passages Professor JEREMIAS is too eager to trim the evidence to suit his theories ; and (2) that his final resolution of the contradiction between Parts I and II is highly speculative and lacks sufficient basis in the recorded teaching of Jesus. Nevertheless, this is a very stimulating contribution to a complicated problem which in recent days has been exercising many of our *Neutestamentlers* (including T. W. Manson), and though we may disagree at this point or that, our debt abides to Joachim JEREMIAS of Göttingen.

A disturbing but probably a salutary experience awaits the reader of a book that has recently come our way.[1] Its author is by training a journalist as well as a clergyman, and he is at present both editor of ' The Church of England Newspaper ' and director and secretary of the Modern Churchmen's Union. It is the Church of England that he knows best and it is chiefly of that Church that he writes ; but his outlook is comprehensive, and many of his observations and conclusions apply to Britain as a whole and to all the religious bodies therein.

His first chapter on the facts of the present crisis may be summarized in the conclusion that wherever technological civilization takes root supernatural religion is undermined. The one startling exception is America ; but our author, on the basis not of personal observation but of the reports of others, is inclined to suggest that the flourishing religion of America has itself been secularized and that, while derived from the Christian faith and providing a workable answer to the major questions men ask of existence, it is largely a sanctified humanism.

More important is the second chapter, which offers a diagnosis of the crisis. There are some new points here. For example, Mr. RHODES holds that the shame for our unsociological past is considerably overdone, and he asks for evidence that the industrial proletariat ever were in any of the churches. Despite the early efforts of the Methodists and the pockets of religion that undoubtedly flourished in certain districts, such as South Wales, the working class was never won over, and when William Booth began his evangelism he had to seek the working class on the streets because they could not be persuaded to come indoors. Nowadays, he believes, the Salvation Army cannot make contact with the unchurched in general even on the streets. Yet the great mass of the British people seem to have some kind of residual interest in religion. They affirm their belief in God and their reverence for Christ and few would assert that life ends at the grave ; yet church-going is emphatically rejected. How can this be explained ? Our author's answer is that their indifference to the Church is not a question of will but of capacity. Even some clergy whose faith and self-sacrifice are indubitable have told him with pain that the sacraments no longer convey anything to them. As for the masses it is not that they have encountered the moral and spiritual challenge and turned away, but rather that the challenge does not exist for them. They are no more capable of responding to the traditional presentations of the Christian faith than they are of bending their elbows backward. Clearly this is much more serious than the difficulties that have continually beset the Church in its long history. Mr. RHODES goes so far as to say that this crisis is the most serious that religion has ever had to confront. Even if one allows for some exaggeration here, as also in his statement that ' the Church does not confront merely a new intellectual or cultural or social situation : it confronts a new kind of man and woman ' ; yet the situation is profoundly serious. Surveys may indicate that the majority of our contemporaries are conscious of spiritual need and retain a vestigial belief in God and Christ, but if they reject the Church, what likelihood is there that that belief will persist ? Without the sustenance of the

[1] Rev. C. O. Rhodes, M.A., *The New Church in the New Age* (Jenkins ; 21s. net).

Church will it not decline further, as already it is doing among the youth ?

There are indeed indications that something like a substitute for the Church is already coming into existence to meet the new type of man on his own secular level, where he can comprehend what it offers. It is a Church without a creed but with an ideal that is not ignoble, an ideal of personal concern, health and happiness. It is, in fact, the welfare system, a national church whose priests are all those to whom the public look for guidance—the civil servants who administer it, the personnel officers in factories, the teachers, club leaders and probation officers, and perhaps one should add the medical men and particularly those who specialize in mental therapy. For worship it provides the monarchy and the forms of the democratic State, and instead of the powers of darkness it points to gangsters, dope-traffickers and communists.

Omitting many interesting points chiefly relevant to the Anglican communion, we hasten on to our author's handling of the main question, how the Church may recover contact with the millions who often show signs of spiritual hunger but never think of turning to the Church for its satisfaction. He sees no hope in attempts to restore the past, whether these be by way of a revision of the canon law or a revival of nineteenth-century evangelism. On the other hand he is equally emphatic in holding that the Church must beware lest, in coming to terms with the present situation, it should be the wrong things that are chosen for imitation. There is a real danger lest when we see the success of modern techniques we should welcome them too uncritically on the plea that what can be used for the devil's purposes can equally well be used for God's. If the popular press can win millions of readers, why not have a popular Christian newspaper carrying its life-giving message daily into the homes of the people ? If the cinemas can get long queues on a Saturday while the churches are empty on a Sunday, why not use the cinema for the Church's propaganda ? Why not adopt the methods of commercial advertisement ? Why not campaign for the Kingdom of God with the most up-to-date methods and assail the hosts of evil with the weapons of modernity ?

The question arises, however, whether these modern media are as successful as they are only because they appeal to the masses as they are—if not indeed to something a little lower. Propaganda touches people on the level of their lower nature and creates a suggestible mood in which it can introduce its own ideas ; but try to use the media of mass propaganda for lofty purposes and the audience will disappear. The propagandist with modern techniques can do almost anything with the masses except impart to them the true faith, for faith is personal and individual, whereas modern techniques are general and impersonal. Supposing a great Christian propaganda campaign in modern style were a possibility at all, the results can be foreseen. Either it would make no impact because it would have no point of contact, or it would condition the people to the appearance of faith ; but that would be simply because the Church would have added one more to the depersonalizing forces of our present civilization, and in the process the Christianity into which it had conditioned the people would be perverted out of recognition by the necessities of the media. Christianity is essentially social, whereas modern techniques individualize. Print, cinema, radio, television involve solitary experiences, even though millions may be having these experiences at the same time.

Modern media may be used as means of communication, but their value for true religion is limited. The answer to the religious problem is not likely to be one great leader or a church staking all on mass techniques, but the turning of thousands of brave, pioneering, sympathetic folk towards the meeting of this and that apparently small need here and there. Where Mr. RHODES has found parishes going forward creatively it has been through individual contacts generally on a small scale, with techniques kept in their subordinate place. Gracious lives rather than prophetic words are potent for true progress in our day. The Parish and People Movement, the house church and the house communion, teams of church visitors making friendly contact regularly with a specified number of families, individual dealing with parents seeking baptism for their children—such are some of the slow and unspectacular ways of advance toward true fellowship. ' The vocation of the Church at the present time is to nourish the longing for human community which is starved in contemporary civilization and to show by example that such community can only achieve its fullest and richest potentiality if divinely centred.'

Devotional and Pastoral Classics

A Consideration of 'The Introduction to the Devout Life' of St. Francis de Sales

By the Very Reverend Michael Gibbs, Dean of Chester

It is to the Church in France that we owe the life and writings of François de Sales, but there is a sanctified sanity, a Christian common sense and robustness about him which commends his spirit to so many who live on this side of the Channel, and which has helped Christians in all parts of the world to realize the truth of his saying, 'Friends united in prayer know no separation.'

When we read *The Introduction to the Devout Life* we are back in a revolutionary period of Christian religious experience in the West. Though it speaks to devout souls in every age and country, we need, if we are to appreciate its teaching, to set it in the context of the period in which it came to be written. 'In France,' as an English historian has said, 'the religious revival under the Counter Reformation had its own distinct characteristic, the unity of piety with sound learning which made the Church in France for a time the most illustrious in Christendom. It was in the person of St. Francis de Sales (1567–1622), that this revival found its great exponent.' But the revival took place under the stress of conflicting forces. The humanism which resulted from the Renaissance had provoked the reaction of rigorism; not only from the side of the reformers, Calvin and Luther, but from the Inquisition within the Catholic Church which, no less than Luther, suspected and distrusted all forms of mysticism and interior prayer; with the result that prayer, as well as other religious practices, became regimented and standardized. And then, as C. F. Kelly remarks in a telling sentence, 'With Francis the windows were once again opened and, without forgetting the maledictions hanging over worldliness, he made it possible for the world itself to be annexed to the Kingdom of Heaven.' 'He was like a ray of sunlight softly falling on this City of Paris. . . . He introduced God by every door,' writes l'Abbé Huvelin in *Some Spiritual Guides of 17th Century*. One such door, and a very wide open one, has been St. Francis' treatise on *La Vie Dévote*.

What, then, are the characteristics of this work? I hope to show, first, how the book explains itself and, incidentally, explains its author; and then to submit for consideration one or two comments upon its value and applicability for to-day and in our own spiritual climate.

The book is divided into five parts and the First Part is thus described: 'The First Part of *The Introduction* containing instructions and exercises necessary for conducting the soul from her first desire till she be brought to a full resolution to embrace a devout life.' The word 'Devout' (*Dévote*) needs further definition and there follows the description of what it is and how to acquire it; and, further, the claim that it is compatible with every honest calling and profession. 'You aspire to devotion,' he says, 'because, being a Christian, you know it to be a virtue extremely pleasing to the Divine Majesty—*La Divine Majesté*.' It is worth a moment's pause to reflect upon St. Francis' way of referring to Almighty God, here and throughout the treatise. The devotion of a life is something we owe to God by virtue of His Divine Majesty, not a pious extra which some may care to practise. It is the devotion of the whole of life in all its parts to God, not something added to an otherwise worldly life.

In the author's Preface he makes plain the general subject he has in mind. This is what he says: 'Almost all those who have hitherto treated of devotion have had in view the instruction of persons wholly withdrawn from the world, or they have taught a kind of devotion that leads to this absolute retirement. My intention is to instruct those who live in towns, in families or at court. By their condition they are obliged to lead, as to outward appearances, an ordinary life. Frequently, under an imaginary pretence of impossibility, they will not so much as think of undertaking a devout life. . . . I shall prove that, as the firefly passes through the flames without burning its wings, so a vigorous and resolute soul may live in the world without being infected by any of its moods . . . and may fly through the flames of earthly lusts without burning the wings of the holy desires of a devout life.' 'It is true,' he says, 'that it is a difficult task. That is why I wish that many would endeavour to accomplish it with more ardour than has hitherto been shown.'

This is no abstract 'Devotion' of which he speaks, for he goes on to explain that the finished book was based upon notes and instructions given to a certain person while she was under his direction. The book is indeed the outcome of a long

experience of pastoral care. The direction of souls was always a principal activity in the life of St. Francis de Sales, as a priest and a bishop. It was out of this great concern for the advancement and perfection of individual souls that the *Introduction* grew. It so happened that a certain Mme. de Charmoisy found it necessary soon after her marriage to spend the early part of 1607 in Annecy and it was at that time that her spiritual direction was undertaken by Francis, the Bishop, who continued his instructions by letter. Mme. de Charmoisy herself has left an account of the origin of the *Introduction*.

'At the beginning, when I placed my soul in the hands of the said Servant of God, occasion arose for my return to court. As I was greatly apprehensive of this, I went to confer with the said Servant of God, declaring to him my apprehensions. He then said to me "Have courage, my child, do not fear that on this account you will fall back. For if you are faithful to God, He will never fail you; even though He has to stop the sun and moon. He will give you enough time to perform your exercises and all else that you must do." For this reason he determined to give me some instructions in writing upon this subject.'

These she communicated to a Jesuit who urged Francis to have them printed, with the result that Francis composed *The Introduction to the Devout Life* and incorporated the notes into it. I have quoted this account from the Editor's 'Introduction' to a recent English translation, by John K. Ryan, of *La Vie Dévote* (published by Messrs. Longmans in a pocket edition, a translation to be commended).

'He will give you,' said St. Francis to Mme. de Charmoisy, 'enough time to perform your exercises and all else that you must do.' Let us look at what some of those exercises are which found their way into this book and which, if faithfully performed by a busy person living in the world, can be the means by which he or she may become a saint. They may be divided into two kinds: those of private obligation and those of public obligation. The condition of their effectiveness in both cases is the acceptance of obligation with regard to them. This is indeed the principle, as we have seen, underlying the word '*Dévote*': behind all acts of prayer will be the impulse of a whole life owed to God as Creator and Redeemer. With regard to public devotion, though the obligation is enjoined by the public conscience of the Church, it must be accepted lovingly, humbly and obediently by the individual before it can bring grace to the soul. How wisely and reverently he treats that which is the heart and centre of Christian public devotion: the Sacrament of Holy Communion, urging its frequent use. 'If worldly people ask you why you communicate so often, tell them it is to learn to love God, tell them that two classes ought to communicate frequently: the perfect because, being well disposed, they would be greatly to blame not to approach the source and fountain of perfection, and the imperfect, to the end that they may be able justly to aspire to perfection.'

It is in the realm of private devotion, in the inner life, that the crux of the truly devout life exists, for there, with no one to regard or approve but God, the soul performs its exercises as part of its accepted obligation to Him. The chief of these exercises as outlined by St. Francis de Sales is *Mental Prayer*. This to him is the heart of the prayer life. 'Prayer places our understanding in the divine brightness and light and exposes our will to the warmth of heavenly love.' Surely he is writing here of what he knows—'Divine brightness,' 'light,' 'warmth of heavenly love.' These had for long become the characteristic of his own life by the practice of exposing his soul to the love of God in prayer. Above all I recommend to you mental prayer, the prayer of the heart, and particularly that which concerns the life and Passion of our Lord. By making Him often the subject of your meditation your whole soul will be filled with Him. You will learn His ways and frame all your actions according to His model. How is this kind of prayer, this colloquy with God by means of Scripture and in the soul, to be performed? By rule and by the clock. Inclination and mood have nothing to do with it: it is to become a habit of the will consecrated to God. 'Employ an hour every day in this spiritual exercise.' Not many to-day can aspire to this, but it is a matter of observation that those who practise this kind of prayer regularly, according to rule and as a matter of accepted obligation, generally manifest great fruits of grace in their lives and character.

Much of all this is common ground to devout souls everywhere, but a study of *La Vie Dévote* suggests further reflections. It is clear that implicit in all these recommendations is a strict Rule of Life under direction and guidance. The Direction of souls was then part of the discipline of the Catholic Church as no doubt it is to-day. It was a discipline which St. Francis himself had accepted and used all his life. He writes of what he knows himself. All saints are made by God and some come straight from His hand; most, however, are fashioned and refined in the fire of purification and illumination. Of these, few can effect their own purification unaided, for who of us can detect our own deepest faults? And few, again, have the insight and wisdom to direct their own lives along the path of spiritual progress without the guidance of some wise and experienced counsellor. In St.

Francis' system, with the obligation to accept a Rule of Life went the very strong advice to seek guidance in the framing of it, absolution in the breaking of it, and counsel in the adapting of it to the changing circumstances of life in the world. He puts it very strongly: 'Would you walk in earnest towards devotion? Seek some good man who will guide and conduct you. This is the greatest of all words of advice.' It looks indeed as if there was need to stress it for his own people at the time and, by his insistence on it, as if St. Francis was endeavouring to recover for those who came under his care a use which he had come to find of such value to souls in their progress towards perfection. He certainly realized that the exercise of directing souls is not without its cost, both to those who avail themselves of it and for those who give it. From the former it requires real humility and obedience and from the latter sanctity and wisdom.

As a comment upon all this I might venture one observation. The note of serene happiness and joy in the love of God is the great note of St. Francis de Sales. He was accused by his cousin of encouraging people 'to go to heaven in a coach and four.' But are not joy and serenity the fruits of discipline? And are they not so often lacking in English Christians? It is not 'self-discipline' as we commonly think of it, for that does not produce saints; but the discipline of becoming humble through humiliation, of accepting grace through absolution, of reducing the complexities of life to one necessity—that of pleasing God before all else. It is indeed a steep path—the path of the Cross. There are times, as he says, when we need a guide. But like a mountain path in the Alps it has wide views of heaven and earth, and the flowers that grow beside it in the Spring are brighter than anywhere else in the world. These flowers are the virtues of the Christian life which bloom beside the Interior Way of the Cross—the fruits of a life hid with God. Francis writes of these virtues in the Third Part. It is here perhaps that we have the most generally valuable legacy for all time and for all sorts of Christian people.

As he treats of virtues in the Christian life and their practice he shows his clear insight into human nature, into his own heart and into the mind of God as revealed in Christian experience. He displays a wonderful sense of proportion, of what is fitting and when. 'Occasions are not often presented for the experience of fortitude, magnanimity and great generosity, but meekness, temperance, modesty and humility are virtues with which all the actions of our life should be tempered. In the exercise of the virtues we should always prefer that which is most conformable to our duty, not that which is most agreeable to our taste. Among those un-connected with our particular duty, we must prefer the more excellent to the more showy.'

His remarks on humility and patience are the best of all. Gently and with infinite kindness and understanding he insists that patience with ourselves and with our faults is most necessary—that we should proceed 'with mild reason and not with passion in correcting our faults.'

The purpose of such an article as this can only be to encourage those who read it to read *The Introduction* of St. Francis de Sales for themselves. In doing so they will be going back to a source which, probably more than any other single book of mystical theology, has fed the devotional life of Christians in these islands for the past three hundred years. They have not always drawn from it directly but others have dipped their buckets into it and watered the garden of the Church. When Pope Clement VIII called François to an interview preparatory to his being appointed Bishop of Geneva he said to him, 'Drink, my son, from your well spring and from your living sources. May these waters issue forth, so that every one may drink his fill from them.' It has indeed proved so. A host of our own manuals of Devotion to-day are based upon *The Devout Life*. Would that they all displayed the same sanity and sense of proportion when treating of penitence and virtue!

Finally, the book reveals the man. He performed a work for God and religion in the France of his day more important than anything else. Not that in doing so he neglected his Diocese. With his own life so devoted to God in all its parts he would not willingly neglect any of his duties. But if we ask what has had the most far-reaching influence beyond his own country and his own age, the answer would unfailingly be that it was not by good administration and committee work, but by direction and love of individual souls that the spirit of Christ was made to catch fire in the hearts of men and women: and what he did in his life-time, his writings have continued to do for souls in succeeding centuries. He was a product himself of the great system which the Church in the Middle Ages had evolved and which found room for and encouraged a mystical and practical Christian devotion, upon which the whole of Western Christendom has freely drawn. To this he added something peculiarly his own, for saints are never mass produced or cast in a common mould. He had certain insights which were the product of his upbringing and education. A Catholic humanist, he recognized that God also loved pagans and that they too were His children; and pagan writers such as Pliny had much to say which could be used to point a moral and drive

home a point. Well-born himself he did not despise those in high places, but in spiritual things he made them start at the bottom like any one else. He was made Bishop of Geneva chiefly to recover the Province from Protestantism to the Catholic obedience. His maxim was, that love wins more souls than argument, and by the saintliness of his own life he commended both Christ, who was always his master, and the religion which had helped to make him what he was.

The course of his life was itself a witness to the truth that 'all things work together for good to them that love God.' At home in Paris and in Court circles, he exercised a deep influence where influence counted; yet by a stroke of Providence he was appointed to Geneva, and because he could not occupy the See City he found himself living at Annecy, breathing country air, among the more leisured habits of a country people, with the mountains and woods and fields and the wild creatures as his companions when he journeyed. This environment has left its mark upon his writings, and like the fragrance of flowers in early summer his teachings have been carried further by the country winds of the Alps than they could have been if he had stayed on in Paris. To such a rare soul, a child of the Counter Reformation, the Channel has been no barrier. The Eternal truths of the Prayer Life and of Mystical Devotion are carried in the air we breathe, above and across all the waters that divide. His was, in truth, a charming, kind, gay, courteous but deeply devoted life. To him Almighty God was ever *La divine Majesté*, but His Heart was the Heart of Jesus, the Lover of souls. To Francis religion was pure delight, because it taught him to live with God and to discover God in others: as he says, quoting from his namesake of Assisi:

> Such are the joys that lure my sight,
> All pains grow sweet, all labours light.

Vive Jésu, au quel, avec le Père et le Saint Esprit, soit honneur et gloire, maintenant et toujours, et dans les Siècles de Siècles.

Ainsi soit il. So ends *The Introduction to the Devout Life.*

Literature

A NEW COMMENTARY ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

A WELCOME sign in Biblical Studies is the increasing attention which is being given to the Acts of the Apostles. In recent years we have had two commentaries from Professor F. F. Bruce of Sheffield, one on the Greek text and the other on the English version, and now we have a third—*The Acts of the Apostles* (A. and C. Black; 25s. net), by the Rev. C. S. C. Williams, M.A., Fellow of Merton College, Oxford, and University Lecturer in New Testament. The book belongs to the new series known as 'Black's New Testament Commentaries' edited by the Rev. Henry Chadwick, M.A., B.D., of Cambridge, a series which is serving the very useful purpose of promoting the study of the New Testament writings as great religious documents and the primary sources of Christian doctrine.

Mr. Williams has already established his reputation for Biblical scholarship by his valuable contribution to Textual Criticism in his 'Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts' [1951] and has used his special knowledge to great advantage in the new commentary. The Introduction and the commentary itself give full information about the most important contributions to the subject in recent years. Indeed, it is astonishing how much information Mr. Williams has been able to give concerning works and articles not always easy for the general reader to consult. The long bibliography supplied is especially impressive.

Mr. Williams thinks that the evidence for the Lukan authorship of the Acts is fairly strong and holds that of all Paul's companions Luke is most probably the one who wrote the Acts or part of it, maintaining that he 'evinces at least a medical interest.' He gives much attention to the question whether Luke used sources. In this connexion he warns us that any argument based on a comparison of Mk 13 with Lk 21 must be used with caution in view of the tendency now to suppose that Lk 21 'rests on independent tradition rather than on Mark.' He makes a new and attractive suggestion, which he outlined in an article in this journal in 1953 (lxiv. 283 f.), that the 'first treatise' sent to Theophilus was an early draft of Gospel material, and that the Acts was written *before* the Third Gospel, in which 'the early draft' was revised on the basis of Mark's chronology. So far this suggestion has been put forward only tentatively and the need seems urgent to develop it further and to show in what respects 'the early draft' differs from Proto-Luke as Streeter defined it.

Mr. Williams' suggestion is in line with his opinion that the Acts must be dated earlier than has been commonly held, in fact during the period A.D. 66–70. He rejects the claim that Luke used the *Antiquities* of Josephus. 'The present writer,'

he says, ' is not convinced that even if more definite proof were forthcoming that after two years' imprisonment, a prisoner whose accusers did not appear was freed, Luke would not have recorded this release had he known it.' Detailed treatment is given to the speeches and the theology of the Acts, and the opinion of J. H. Bernard is fully endorsed, that the language of the speeches is quite clearly primitive and the theology pre-Pauline. The tendencies of the commentary, it will be seen, are conservative, and the results are all the more valuable because Mr. Williams has taken such full account of the views of other writers. Some readers indeed may find themselves embarrassed by the wealth of his references.

The translation and the commentary itself are admirably executed. Mr. Williams inclines to the South Galatian theory and supplies three useful appendixes which discuss ' The Apostles,' ' The Church,' and ' The Giving of the Spirit.' The commentary is full of good things, in particular, the exposition of Ac 7 (Stephen's Speech), 15^{29} (the Apostolic Decree), and 27 (The Voyage to Rome), and can confidently be recommended to the student and the general reader. VINCENT TAYLOR

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY

It is well known that a number of books entitled ' Old Testament Theology ' have appeared in recent years on the Continent, and this one by Professor Ludwig Koehler—*Old Testament Theology* (Lutterworth Press ; 35s. net)—is the first of them to be translated into English. It is, however, by no means the latest thing in Old Testament theology ; first published in 1935, it has not been essentially changed since then. It is curious that Eichrodt's book of the same title, which began to appear in 1933, is never mentioned ; and though the revision for the 1953 edition is supposed to have added references to what is important in the literature since then, the theologies of Eichrodt, Procksch, Vriezen and Burrows are still not referred to. It may indeed be asked whether this book does not belong in spirit rather to what Old Testament theology was understood to be in the period before Eichrodt.

The naïveté of Koehler's methodology is the best illustration of this. In Old Testament theology the problem of method is central. Only by careful thought can we draw the lines which separate from dogmatics on the one hand and from descriptive history of religion on the other. Carelessness in this respect will mean the intrusion of theological (or anti-theological) prejudices or a distortion of the material offered by religious history. But Professor Koehler starts off quite light-heartedly, as if we all know what Old Testament theology is, and where it begins and ends. The problem can be dismissed with half-a-page in the Foreword. The subject-matter is provided in ' these points of view, thoughts and concepts of the Old Testament which are or can be theologically important.' But who decides what is and what is not theologically important ? Koehler seems to think this will in each case be as obvious to us as it is to him. Certain titles for God, for example, rider upon clouds, he that sits upon the Cherubim, are theologically of no consequence (p. 58). It is wrong to credit the idea of the *living God* with any particular importance for theology (p. 54). ' There are allusions to the spirit of God in the Old Testament which are older than Isaiah, but they are of popular origin and of no theological significance ' (p. 118). In statements of this kind which some would call obvious and others would call prejudiced Koehler reveals himself to us as a kind of non-dogmatic dogmatician, using a hidden canon of theology and revelation to distinguish the significant from the non-significant within the total tradition of Israel.

Certain statements are distressingly over-emphatic, for example, ' Until the time of David, or even Jeremiah, religion has nothing to do with individual character.' In particular, Koehler is against the sacrificial cult, and states it to be a purely human device for self-salvation. ' There is no suggestion anywhere in the Old Testament that sacrifice or any other part of the cult was instituted by God. It knows only the regulation of already existing sacrifice by Divine institution.' The cult is works and not grace, a bit of ethnic life taken over from the heathen, and until Ezekiel's time ' does not belong to the Old Testament revelation.' This seems to the reviewer (1) to ignore much recent progress in Old Testament studies ; (2) to be an impossible interpretation of the texts ; (3) to be in some respects an intrusion from a dogmatically anti-cultic mind, and an intrusion which could have been regulated and limited if methodological strictness had been applied.

In spite of these criticisms this book remains of value as a useful compendium of information, which can be more helpful the more the reader uses a critical judgment towards its more generalised statements. No objection can be raised against its organization round the concept of God as Lord and its partition under God—Man—Judgment and Salvation. It must in fairness to Professor Koehler be stated with regret that the translation often fails to do him justice and the Hebrew words quoted contain a very large number of misprints.

JAMES BARR

STUDIES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

In 1956 the Theology and Ministry Conference adopted as its subject ' The Fourth Gospel ' and

secured a number of distinguished lecturers to speak on various aspects of it. These lectures are now published under the title *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. by F. L. Cross (Mowbray; 12s. 6d. net).

Any book of this type is fortunate which can boast C. H. Dodd as its first contributor. His subject is 'The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel and Christian Worship.' Christian worship is the acknowledgment of the glory of God in the Person of Christ, and it is in the Word made flesh that 'we beheld his glory.' This leads to a consideration of the Logos, and the significance which this concept derives from both its Hebrew and its Greek antecedents.

G. D. Kilpatrick considers the relationship of the Fourth Gospel to Gnosticism, and to the Hermetic and Mandaean writings, and reports on some investigations he has made into the language of this Gospel and that of the Septuagint. He concludes that the writer of this Gospel has *not* borrowed largely from Hellenistic sources. His language is the language of the Greek Bible, and his background mainly that of Biblical religion. His Gospel does not represent an invasion of the Biblical religion by the pagan world, but the invasion of Hellenistic paganism by Judaism and Christianity.

B. Lindars discusses the Gospel as 'An Act of Contemplation,' and C. F. Barker comments on the omission of the word 'repentance' from the Gospel and the Johannine Epistles, and goes on to argue that the theology of the baptismal service in the Anglican Prayer Book is a Johannine theology. T. H. L. Parker summarizes Karl Barth's teaching about the Logos, and claims that Barth's theology is as much Johannine as Pauline. E. Evans studies the use of the word ἀγαπᾶν in this Gospel, and defies the conclusions of other recent scholars by claiming to be able to distinguish a difference of meaning between the Evangelist's use of ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν, especially in the conversation between the Risen Christ and Peter in Jn 21. He somewhat undercuts the strength of his own arguments in the last paragraph by his frank admission that in the Syriac Version both Greek verbs are rendered by the same word, a fact of special significance because Syriac would be a language closely akin to that used in the original conversation.

J. N. Sanders revives what he admits is a 'highly speculative hypothesis'—that the disciple whom Jesus loved was indeed no other than Lazarus, basing it largely on the repeated comment in 11^5 and 11^{36} that Jesus loved Lazarus. G. L. Phillips writes on faith and vision in this Gospel, and argues for a discernible difference in the meanings attached to the three Greek words for 'see'—βλέπειν, ὁρᾶν, θεᾶσθαι. U. E. Simons concludes the book with an article on 'Eternal Life in the Fourth Gospel.'

A reader of the book, perhaps more than listeners to the lectures, feels himself wishing for something more systematic and co-ordinated than he finds here. There are some features of the Fourth Gospel of great current interest which find no place in the lectures—as, for instance, the claim, that some are making, for very close similarities between this Gospel and writings among the Dead Sea Scrolls, the doubt whether this Evangelist did or did not know the Synoptics, and the perennial question whether the writer intended his Gospel to be taken as history or only as a dramatic presentation of spiritual truth. But undoubtedly every student of the Fourth Gospel will find here many items which are interesting and some which are important.

C. L. Mitton

ARCHITECT AND PREACHER

An Architect Preaches, by the Rev. H. Harold Kent (Independent Press; 10s. 6d. net), has the right to be considered a unique book of sermons, because it has been written by a man who is at one and the same time a well-known practising architect and the minister of a Christian congregation in Canada. In ancient Judaism a Rabbi always had a trade. In those days a Rabbi had to teach for nothing, and had to satisfy the ordinary needs of living by engaging in some trade. Hence, for instance, to quote the most famous of all instances, Paul was to trade a tent-maker. Mr. Kent, then, is doing what the great Rabbis did.

His book of sermons is of the greatest interest in its own right. The sermons are Scriptural, doctrinal, vital and relevant. This is preaching of which no man would have any need to be ashamed under any circumstances.

Mr. Kent has a sermon on a subject which preachers very seldom deal with—the phrase in the creed, 'He descended into Hell.' He begins by proving that Hell in this phrase is not the place of torture, but the abode of all the dead, and that it may be, as for Dives, a place of torture, and, as for Lazarus, a place of bliss. For Dives it was not only a place of torture, it was also a place of prayer. What, then, does it mean to say that Jesus descended into Hell? For one thing, it lays down the fact that Jesus was really and truly dead, that He did pass through the real experience of death. Second, it lays down the identification of Jesus with sinners in their final desolation. Third, He went to Hell, not to give the spirits a second chance, but to proclaim the victory which He had for ever won on Calvary. Fourth, by His going to Hell He took captivity captive and led out of

Hell all the righteous of the earlier ages. And that means that for us now, through the work of Christ, there is no longer any intermediate state, but after death there comes immediate blessedness. Clearly, that is brave and thoughtful preaching, not afraid to grapple with the great problems.

This is, indeed, in its own right a notable book of sermons. We would offer but one criticism. These sermons are now printed from recorded versions of them. We gather that they were not initially written in full; and we feel that, fine as they are, they might have benefited from the original discipline of having been written *before* they were preached. But maybe such criticism is ungracious, and we are grateful for them as they are.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

GLASGOW ORIENTAL SOCIETY

The Glasgow University Oriental Society continues to flourish and to publish some of the papers read to the Society in its *Transactions*, volume xvi. [1955–1956] of which has now appeared (obtainable from Rev. T. Crouther Gordon, The Manse, Clackmannan; 15s. net). This volume is published in honour of the Rev. James Robertson Buchanan, B.D., Ph.D., whose photograph stands as a frontispiece. A short note on Dr. Buchanan is given, and four papers are published, together with three further articles written in honour of Dr. Buchanan. Dr. John Bowman has a paper on 'Ezekiel and the Zadokite Priesthood' in which he reconstructs some pages of the history of the priesthood from Ezekiel to the Priestly Code, making use of his own Samaritan studies. This short paper is an important one, marked by the erudition which characterizes all Dr. Bowman's work. Professor G. A. F. Knight has a brief paper on the concept of chaos, and its significance. Mr. J. M. Allegro, a member of the international team working on the Dead Sea Scrolls, contributes a paper giving the latest news about the finds up to the time of its delivery, including some account of the Copper Scroll, which was brought to Manchester to be unrolled on his initiative, and in whose unrolling he played a part. Professor Sweetman has a valuable paper on the religious ideas of the Persian mystic Jalalu'd Dīn Rumi. The supplementary articles are all in the field of Arabic studies. Dr. H. G. Farmer writes on the 'ethos' of rhythm, colour and perfume in the work of Al-Kindī; Dr. James Robson on the form of Muslim tradition; and Dr. Montgomery Watt on the early development of the Muslim attitude to the Bible. Of these the last will probably be of most interest to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, especially for its study of the way in which prophecies of Muhammad were found in the Old Testament. The editor, Professor Mullo Weir, is to be congratulated on producing a volume of such high standard, and the Society on the quality of the papers read to it.

H. H. ROWLEY

That pastoral theology is a formal branch of theology resulting from study of Christian shepherding, that it is as important as Biblical or doctrinal or historical theology, and that it is no less the concern of the local minister than of the specialist —these are some of the contentions of Professor Seward Hiltner of the University of Chicago in *Preface to Pastoral Theology* (Abingdon Press; $4.00).

The book may be commended to practitioners in the field of pastoral counselling; but for the general reader its interest will lie chiefly in the extensive use made of the detailed records of pastoral interviews published more than a century ago by the Rev. Ichabod Spencer, Presbyterian Minister at Brooklyn, New York. Comments on these records from the point of view of modern psychology are illuminating.

John Wyclif and the First English Bible, by P. W. H. Frederick, M.A., D.D., Professor Emeritus, Central Lutheran Theological Seminary, Fremont, Nebraska (Book Store, Central Lutheran Theological Seminary, 538 West 16th Street, Fremont, Nebraska; 75 cents), is a slim little book of forty-one pages, but it is a masterly portrait of Wyclif and of his work. Here we see Wyclif the scholar, Master or Warden of Balliol and Master of Canterbury Hall; Rector of Fillingham and later of Lutterworth; member of the Royal Commission sent to Bruges to confer with the papal delegation. Here we have Purvey's Foreword to the English Bible: 'A simple creature hath translated the Bible out of Latin into English. First, this simple creature had much travail with divers fellows and helpers, to gather many old Bibles and other doctors and common glosses, and to make one Latin Bible some deal true; and then to study it anew, the text with the gloss, and other doctors as he might get, and especially Lyra on the Old Testament, that hath helped full much in this work; the third time, to counsel with old grammarians and old divines of hard works and hard sentences, how they might best be understood and translated; the fourth time, to translate as clearly as he could to the sense and to have many good fellows and cunning at the translating.' A recipe for all translators!

This book has an excellent bibliography. It is a work of real scholarship and gives a more vivid picture of Wyclif than many volumes many times its sizes.

The Whispering Gallery is a revised and enlarged edition of a collection of addresses to girls and boys by the Rev. Sidney H. Price (Carey Kingsgate ; 5s. net). The first edition appeared before the War and some of the talks will be familiar to some readers of this journal, for it was in its pages that they first came out. There are fifty-two talks in all, making a thoroughly good and varied collection.

An unusual book for morning devotions has come our way—*Begin with a Hymn*, by Ida and Leslie Church (Epworth Press ; 8s. 6d. net). It is divided into material for twenty-six weeks. First come the words of a famous hymn ; then a brief commentary upon it, its writer, its message and its influence ; then daily Bible readings for the week, and, finally, a brief prayer appropriate to the main thought. We trust this book will be widely used to provide variety in private devotions and to suggest how other hymns and passages may be similarly used.

Last year Dr. Donald Soper preached five sermons in Kingsway Hall on Faber's hymn 'Workman of God.' The interest aroused was so great as to call for their printing, *via* a tape-recording, in a booklet—*It is hard to Work for God* (Epworth Press ; 3s. 6d. net). Herein Dr. Soper points with simple and moving clarity to what is demanded of those who believe in the God whose love touches life at every point of need, and who has a word for those who have entrusted their lives to His keeping. The sermons are pointed and relevant and suggest how much can be done to explore the significance of many other hymns sung with as much fervour as lack of thought.

That They Might Have Life, by the Rev. Edward Rogers (Epworth Press ; paper covers, 5s. net ; cloth covers, 7s. 6d. net), is the Methodist Lent book for 1958.

The book is written from a very definite point of view. When Mr. Rogers was the minister of a congregation he made a careful study of the narrative of the Cross and of the Resurrection for the purposes of dramatic representation. As a result of that study he 'began to feel that there was something subtly and tragically wrong in any emphasis on the agony of the Cross which dimmed the brightness of the Resurrection, and suggested that it was endured pain rather than overcoming love which secured man's salvation.' Where do the thoughts of the Christian travel as he begins Lent ? What is the end of these thoughts ? 'Is it the darkness that covered the earth at noon, swirling round the pain and anguish of the Cross ? Or is it the dazzling, mysterious early morning brightness that shone from an empty tomb ? '

To Mr. Rogers it appears a dangerous fact that in certain lines of preaching and theology the Cross has overshadowed the Resurrection, as if the whole purpose of God was completed on Calvary. 'The truth is . . . that the Crucifixion cannot be interpreted and understood save in the light of the Resurrection.'

For Mr. Rogers, then, Jesus Christ is the great life-bringer. The question then becomes: 'If Jesus came that we might have life, how much of that life have I been willing to receive ? ' The tragedy is that within the Church, instead of this surging power of life, we are so apt to get, 'tedious homilies, the smell of hymn-books, the petty round of ecclesiastical functions, the collection bag,' as Nathaniel Micklem put it. The person who is brought into the Church is 'led to expect the food of paradise and gets instead a schoolroom tea.'

Mr. Rogers expounds this life in terms of power, love, fellowship, service, truth. This is a book which admirably combines devotion and challenge. It is not only a Lent book for 1958 ; it is a book of permanent and far-reaching value.

The Gospel and the Church in a Pagan World, by Principal W. Gordon Robinson (Independent Press ; 12s. 6d. net), is a study in 1 Corinthians. Dr. Robinson distinguishes a threefold theme in 1 Corinthians—'The Gospel, the Church and the Christian in a pagan world.'

This is a book written with vivid directness and with a gift for making the New Testament teaching relevant to the modern world. While this book is popular, there is behind it real scholarship, as, for instance, in the excellent note on speaking with tongues, or *glossolalia*. There is illumination on every page of this book ; and it will be of great value for Bible Study groups, or for preachers and teachers who wish to make a series of studies or sermons on 1 Corinthians.

What is a religious artist—one who chooses religious themes or who uses his art to interpret religion ? To this question the gifted and versatile General Secretary of the World Council of Churches addresses himself in *Rembrandt and the Gospel* (S.C.M. ; 25s. net). Dr. Visser 't Hooft traces Rembrandt's pilgrimage from the sentimental beginnings when the Bible merely provided themes for the brush, through hardship and sorrow, to the time of fruition when he used his art 'to express a faith exclusively rooted in the gospel.' The text, well translated by K. Gregor Smith, and splendidly printed, is illustrated by thirty-two examples of Rembrandt's work, in varied media.

Contributions and Comments

Ἁρπαγμός and ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν in Philippians ii. 6, 7

In the December 1957 number of The Expository Times, the Rev. J. M. Furness gave a summary of the comments of J. Ross and W. Warren on these two expressions in their contributions to *The Journal of Theological Studies* (July, 1909 and April, 1911 respectively), and suggested that little attention had been given to their opinions.

It seems to be the case that these brief discussions (and more especially that of Ross) have not been given much prominence in more recent work, but it may be pointed out that other scholars have independently offered interpretations which have certain points in common with those of Ross and Warren. Without attempting any complete survey of the relevant literature, we refer here to a few treatments of these difficult expressions.

1. ἁρπαγμός. For instance, it should be noted that H. A. A. Kennedy, in *The Expositor's Greek Testament* (iii. [Philippians], 436 f.) made certain comments which are in harmony with Ross's standpoint on particular problems. His interpretation of ἁρπαγμός itself is very similar: 'We cannot find any passage where ἁρπάζω or any of its derivatives has the sense of "holding in possession," "retaining." It seems invariably to mean "*seize*," "*snatch violently*." Thus it is not permissible to glide from the true sense "grasp at" into one which is totally different, "hold fast"' (*Philippians, in loc.*). In view of *v.* 10, we are to think of Christ (who has always shared in the Divine nature) as being given by God as a gift, the dignity of κύριος (which is a relation to mankind) as the 'reward and crowning-point of the whole process of His voluntary humiliation.' 'He did not regard the being on an equality with God as a thing to be seized, violently snatched.' Kennedy goes on to suggest that Christ's refusal to use miraculous powers to compel belief and His acceptance rather of suffering and death as the pathway to the dignity of κυριότης is exemplified by the Temptation experience, 'in which our Lord was tempted to reach τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ in the way of ἁρπάζειν, forcing men out of sheer amazement to accept His claim and exalt Him as Lord.' Kennedy also comments tentatively that 'perhaps the curious negative expression οὐχ ἁρπαγμ.κ.τ.λ. has been suggested by a comparison with the first Adam who sought to reach "equality with God" by means of ἁρπάζειν.'

We have quoted freely from *The Expositor's Greek Testament* in order to show that Kennedy's interpretation is akin to that of Ross in the view taken as to ἁρπαγμός, and in the reference to the Temptation story, while there is also a tentative approach toward the Second Adam idea, which Mr. Furness considers to have been insufficiently applied in this context.

J. H. Michael[1] also accepted the view that ἁρπαγμός should be taken in the sense of 'booty to be snatched' rather than 'booty to be retained.' Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the text of Moffatt's translation which accompanies Michael's commentary renders the relevant phrase 'he did not snatch at equality with God' (implying the sense '*res rapienda*'), whereas copies of Moffatt's translation itself, at least subsequent to its 1934 revision, render 'he did not *set store upon* equality with God' (implying the sense '*res rapta*'). Apparently the original edition of Moffatt's translation (which is not available to the present writer) accepted the '*res rapienda*' interpretation; so the earlier translation in Moffatt's *The Historical New Testament* [1901] would suggest 'considered not equality with God a prize *to be seized*.'

A. M. Hunter, in his *Paul and his Predecessors*[2] [1940] argued (following Lohmeyer's view of the passage in general, though not in all particulars), that Ph 2^{6-11} is 'a pre-Pauline Jewish Christian hymn' quoted by the Apostle, but in several respects un-characteristic of his thought. He summarizes its content thus[3]: 'Its theme is Jesus, the Second Adam who, conquering the temptation to which the First Adam fell, chose the rôle of the Suffering Servant and for his obedience unto death was highly exalted by God, and made "Lord" of the whole cosmos.' Dr. Hunter renders ἁρπαγμός 'something to be seized' and also accepts the suggestion that μορφή in this context has the sense of 'image.'[4] He thus translates *v.* 6 as follows:

> Who being in God's image
> Did not consider equality with God
> Something to be seized.

---

[1] *Philippians* in *The Moffatt New Testament Commentary* [1928], 88, 89.

[2] Pp. 45–51. Cf. also the summary and discussion of Lohmeyer's treatment of Ph 2^{6-11} in W. K. Lowther Clarke, *New Testament Problems* [1929], 143–147.

[3] P. 46.

[4] Hunter refers to a study by J. Héring, and briefly summarizes the evidence for the use of μορφή as an equivalent for εἰκων. Cf. more recently P. Bonnard, *L'épitre de saint Paul aux Philippiens* [1950], 43.

Dr. Hunter unreservedly interprets this verse in the light of the First Adam–Second Adam antithesis, and takes τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ as echoing 'eritis sicut deus.'

Similar expositions of the passage with reference to ἁρπαγμός and the Second Adam idea have been given by A. E. J. Rawlinson [1] and G. S. Duncan.[2]

It should be mentioned too, that a somewhat weakened sense of ἁρπαγμός has been accepted by some scholars, *i.e.*, that of 'a lucky find' or 'windfall.' [3]

We may well judge, however, that the more vigorous rendering is to be preferred in this context as affording a more effective contrast.

If that is so, one point which does not appear to have been discussed hitherto, to the present writer's knowledge, is the possible affinity between Ph 2^6 and the enigmatic saying of Jesus recorded in Mt 11^{12}. It is unfortunate that the latter text is also difficult to elucidate; but if we take βιάζεται as a passive rather than a middle, and attach a conative significance to the present tense in ἁρπάζουσιν (the Kingdom of Heaven suffers violence, and men of violence are *trying* to make it their spoil),[4] then we are not very far removed from the thought of Ph 2^6. The presence of the verb ἁρπαζω in Mt 11^{12} is perhaps not a mere casual link with Ph 2^6. It is interesting in this connexion to turn to A. H. McNeile's statement of what he considers was most probably in the mind of Jesus as He uttered this saying perhaps in a different context: 'The Kingdom is treated as a ἁρπαγμός, and violently snatched at, *i.e.*, by those who thought of the Messianic blessings as political, and tried to reach them by rebellion and war, as, *e.g.*, in A.D. 6, when the Romans for the first time subjected Judaea to taxation. The Lord Himself was tempted (iv. 8 f.) to reach an earthly sovereignty; cf. Jo vi. 15.'[5] But it must be confessed that the meaning of Mt 11^{12} is highly problematical, especially in its present setting, and quite different interpretations from that given above have been offered.[6]

[1] *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ* [1926], 134 f.

[2] *Jesus, Son of Man* [1947], 193 f.

[3] See for details Arndt and Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* [1957], 108. We note the acceptance of this rendering by A. D. Nock (*Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*, ed. Rawlinson [1928], 99—'a lucky find'); cf. Nock, *St. Paul* [1938], 224—'a piece of luck.'

[4] Thus, *e.g.*, B. T. D. Smith, *St. Matthew* [*Cambridge Greek Testament*, 1927], 126. Cf. also Oscar Cullmann, *The State in the New Testament* [1957], 20 f. He takes the saying as referring to those 'who offer violence to the Kingdom of God, the violent who seize it by force.'

[5] *The Gospel according to St. Matthew* [1915], 155.

[6] See, *e.g.*, T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* [1949], 134 f.

2. ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν. Mr. Furness gives a clear *résumé* of W. Warren's main contentions in his *J.T.S.* note.

Perhaps we may comment on one particular point here, *i.e.*, the suggested parallelism with Is 53^{12}. Warren remarked tentatively, without developing the point, that the expression ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν 'is perhaps an equivalent for הֶעֱרָה לַמָּוֶת נַפְשׁוֹ, Is 53^{12},' and proceeded to bring out the implications of the idea that 'what he poured out was Himself, emptying His fullness into us.' [7] Mr. Furness raises the question whether there is a parallel intended with the Servant's pouring out of his soul unto death (Is 53^{12}).

It may be noted that H. Wheeler Robinson, in his *The Cross of the Servant* [1926],[8] argued strongly in favour of the dependence of the phrase ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν on Is 53^{12}. After dealing with some of the more widely recognized parallels between our passage as a whole and Deutero-Isaiah, he went on to suggest that 'the most remarkable parallel is one that has not apparently been recognized, because it does not lie on the surface,' and put forward the view that in the Hebrew text of Is 53^{12} we find the very phrase Paul here used 'he emptied himself to death'; in his own translation of the last Servant poem, Robinson renders the first clause of *v.* 12 'Because he emptied out his life to death.' The thought implied in ἐκένωσεν is completed in the reference to death in *v.* 8, after several intervening participial clauses describing Christ's life on earth, which form a typical Pauline parenthesis. The primary emphasis in the passage is on the death of Christ; 'the Kenosis was properly that of the Crucifixion, though naturally involving the Incarnation.'

Other details of Wheeler Robinson's discussion need not be elaborated here; we note that in the Preface to *The Cross of the Servant* he draws attention to his treatment of Ph 2^7 as a new interpretation.[9]

[7] It is just possibly significant that Warren does not quote the complete phrase הֶעֱרָה לַמָּוֶת נַפְשׁוֹ; at least his subsequent discussion does not lay any stress on 'self-emptying' unto *death*.

[8] Pp. 72–74; incorporated now in *The Cross in the Old Testament* [1957], see pp. 103–105.

[9] The fact that C. Taylor (*Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* [2nd ed. 1897], Additional Notes, p. 167) had compared the two passages in question must have escaped his notice. Taylor renders the phrase in Is 53^{12} 'he emptied out his soul to death,' and adds some comments of Rashi on similar uses of the verb in other contexts. H. A. A. Kennedy (*op. cit.*, 438 f.), and J. H. Michael (*op. cit.*, 90), refer to Taylor in this connexion. It should be pointed out, perhaps, that Taylor's reference is a very brief one, and that he does not comment on the significance of the parallelism, as Wheeler Robinson does.

C. H. Dodd, in a review of certain sections of Kittel's *Wörterbuch*,[1] independently made some comments tending in the same direction, though more guardedly. After briefly summarizing Oepke's discussion of κενόω in Kittel, Band iii. (which is chiefly concerned with the use of the verb in profane Greek and in other Pauline passages), Dodd points out that the usage in other Pauline contexts is not necessarily decisive for Ph 2^{6}. 'If, however, (as Lohmeyer and others hold), Ph 2^{5-11} represents a pre-Pauline hymn, or if, alternatively, Paul is using an already established form of expression, it is worth while recalling that ἐκκενοῦν is used in three places in the LXX to render the piel of ערה, and that the hiphil of the same verb is used in Is 53^{12} which might therefore have been appropriately translated ἐξεκένωσεν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ εἰς θάνατον. Is it possible that there is in Ph 2^{7} an allusion to this passage?' Dodd goes on to mention the other features of Ph 2 which recall the last Servant Song, and concludes: 'The possibility should not be excluded that the Isaianic Suffering Servant lies somewhere in the background of the Christological passage.'[2] Other scholars who accept this interpretation are A. M. Hunter[3] and J. Jeremias.[4] The latter writes: 'The decisive proof of the connexion of Ph 2^{6-11} with Is 53 lies in the fact that the expression ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν (Ph 2^{7}), attested nowhere else in the Greek and grammatically extremely harsh, is an exact rendering of נַפְשׁוֹ . . . הֶעֱרָה (Is 53^{12}).' He refers in a note[5] to Wheeler Robinson's *Cross of the Servant*, and makes a similar judgment to Robinson's as to the reference intended in ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν: 'The use of Is 53^{12} shows that the expression implies the surrender of life, not the *kenosis* of the incarnation.' D. R. Griffiths

University College, Cardiff

[1] *Journal of Theological Studies*, xxxix. [July, 1938] 292.

[2] Cf. more recently C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* [1952], 93, where the parallelism between Is 53^{12} and Ph 2^{7-8} is set forth without reservation.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 50. Hunter argues that the interpretation of Christ's death in terms of the Suffering Servant conception is pre-Pauline.

[4] W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, *The Servant of God* [1957], 97. Cf. also *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan* [1953], 154, n. 3.

[5] P. 445.

Barnabas i. 8

'But I will show you a few things, not as a teacher but as one of yourselves, in which you shall rejoice at this present time.'

It is generally agreed that the Epistle of Barnabas is an Alexandrian composition, most probably dating from the reign of Hadrian, addressed to a Jewish-Christian community somewhere or other in Egypt who were in danger of falling back into Judaism—the writer having visited the community in the past (i. 4). Barnabas i. 8, cf. iv. 9, is usually taken as an indication of the writer's humility and warm feeling towards this Church—by no means an unattractive counterpart to his somewhat arid exegesis of the Old Testament. This is of course possible in which case the writer may have had in mind the *verbum Christi* (Mt 23^{8}): 'But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your teacher, and all ye are brethren.' We wish however to suggest that the writer was conscious that he did not belong to the ranks of 'teachers' and 'prophets' but only qualified as a 'travelling apostle.' In the Pauline epistles the word apostle is used not only of the Twelve but in the wider sense of a commissioned travelling Church missionary (1 Co 4^{9}, Ro 16^{7}) and traces of this use are found in Ac $14^{4.14}$ where Barnabas and Paul are described as apostles. This conception of the apostolate also appears in Didache xi. 3–6 where apostles are itinerant preachers of the gospel in contrast to the teachers and prophets. Have we in Barnabas i. 8 a glimpse of the Christian ministry in Egypt at a primitive stage in its development early in the second century A.D.?[6] And may not this account for the ascription of the epistle to one who was also an apostle in this wider sense?

L. W. Barnard

Shaw, Wilts.

[6] There is evidence that the monarchical episcopate was a relatively late development in Alexandria and that in this, as in other matters, Egyptian practice differed from that of the other major sees. Fully documented in J. B. Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Philippians*, 230–32.

Paul's Certainties

IV. The Validity of Moral Standards and the Sinfulness of Man

By the Reverend Professor George Johnston, B.D., Ph.D., Emmanuel College, University of Toronto, Canada

'We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin.'—Ro 7^{14} (R.S.V.).

When Paul says here 'We know,' he is appealing to the Christian experience and beliefs of his readers, most of whom were unknown to him and had accepted the gospel of Jesus Christ as Lord from other preachers. He addresses them as 'brethren' (1^{13}), because through the faith that is common to them and him a new brotherhood had arisen among men and women of diverse nations, a society of those who know that they are beloved of God and that their chief business is to love one another. The primary fact of their life was not so much this certainty about Divine law and man's sin as the wonder of grace God had done for people like themselves. These early Christians were exuberant folk—kind, chaste, brave and (for the most part) invincible—seeing that first of all they had been humbled into personal commitment to God the Father through the sacrificial life and death of Jesus; and because the Spirit of Jesus had entered into them with power.

I

'The law is spiritual.' About this the first thing to be said is that *it takes the fact of God seriously*.

The Apostle had already declared that even to non-Jews the plain truth of God's sovereign might had been revealed through His creation ($1^{19.\ 21}$), and with that knowledge he coupled the fact of conscience (2^{15}). It would have seemed incredible to Paul that one could confess the existence of God apart from human responsibility to God. Moral law is Divine law and *ipso facto* it is binding upon mankind.

Now it may well appear at the outset that modern people cannot make Paul's assumptions. Let a *sputnik* rise into space and at once foolish men declare that the fact of God has been disproved. If only God had asserted Himself to repel the *hybris* of invasion, what a 'sign' that would have been! It might have clinched the whole theistic argument once and for all—or demonstrated that God dwells in our own galaxy. Again, it may be said that our cosmology must be demythologized in view of the formula that E equals m multiplied by the square of c. What room in the space-time continuum is there for a personal Intelligence, a Divine Creator, in this fine new cosmos? On the one hand, a distinguished philosopher, like the late Samuel Alexander, will tell us that God is in process of being evolved; on the other, a letter to the editor just the other day will inform us that 'Natural science has pushed God into an even greater remoteness, until His function as ruler and dictator disappears and He becomes a mere first cause or vague general principle. . . . God, equally with gods, angels, demons, spirits, and other small spiritual fry, is a human product, arising inevitably from a certain kind of ignorance and a certain degree of helplessness with regard to man's external environment. . . . God is simply fading away . . .' (*Globe and Mail* [Toronto, 20th February, 1958]).

There is no single theoretical answer to such scepticism, for one has always to take into account the actual life-situations of the critics; religion is not precisely the same as theology or a religious metaphysic; and it is extremely doubtful if one can be argued into conviction or at any rate the sort of conviction that has lively power. Believing in God may not involve understanding Tillich's ideas of Being and Existence, though it may emerge from wrestling with his concept of man's 'ultimate concern' or from subjecting oneself to his great sermons. God, as Christians know Him, is no theistic principle, no merely logical first cause or unmoved Mover. He is the Creator who invented atoms and animals and people for His pleasure and their good, and therefore is our Judge. He is the voice within speaking categorical imperatives about right and wrong. He is the love that cares for us before our birth and all our lives, and His activity may be apprehended in world history as well as personal by those who have 'eyes to see.' We may choose to be too clever to believe in God. We may fill up our time with worldly interests and things that bear on our own egotistic welfare. We may define the right and the good by the rules of the State (communist, fascist, democratic) or the convenience of each man ('I shall be my own State'). If we do, we shall discover that thoughts of God simply fade away. But that is far from showing that God Himself is a nonentity or that He is at death's door. In fact it may

simply prove that this is one of God's laws, the rule of spiritual atrophy.

Paul believed in God for many reasons, but chiefly because he believed in Jesus risen from the dead as a redeemer of men and women. Paul had thought his way through the implications of his nation's history and been confirmed in the belief that God is in control. Christians have nothing to be ashamed of in their faith that God is, that He is holy, just and loving, that He is universal Lord. They, too, must think through to-day what this means in the light of Jesus and the history of the Church since Pentecost, so that they may present to their contemporaries the reasonableness of this folly that is the gospel: the glory of God in the face of Jesus the Jew out of Nazareth, the salvation open to every nation in seething Africa, in revolutionary Asia, and to the ends of the earth by loyalty to that Jew and His Father. The law is valid in these lands and in our day because it springs from the mind of the Eternal.

II

'The law is spiritual.' The second thing to be said is that *it takes seriously the 'election' of Israel.*

The implications of the history of his nation were for Paul, as for Jesus and the writers of the New Testament as a whole, that God had given to ancient Israel a special commission to be His servant to the nations. 'To them belong the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, and the promises; to them belong the patriarchs,' and from them, so far as His manhood was concerned, was descended Jesus the Messiah ($9^{4f.}$).

This is the claim of the entire Bible, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had received a heavenly vision and call, and that the twelve sons of Jacob (Israel) had succeeded to the Covenant made with Abraham (Gn 12). At Sinai under Moses Israel had contracted to serve God, and throughout its history it had been bound by the Law of Moses which revealed the Divine will. 'So the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good' (7^{12}). They offered sacrifices, as the Law commanded; they organized the national life, as the Law commanded; they married and had children, they made war and pledged treaties, they liberated slaves, divorced their wives, cultivated the land and educated their families, as the Law commanded; or at least according to the priestly and prophetic *torah* by which over the years this Law had been interpreted. Paul and his fellow-students of the Old Testament did not interpret along the lines of nineteenth-century liberal scholarship, but simply took their Scriptures as the Word of God. Paul as a Christian judged that at any given time most of Israel had been unfaithful to the will of God, and so doing simply followed the teaching of the great prophets, the Deuteronomist, and John the Baptist. He also preached that Jesus though crucified was the God-sent Messiah, the Divine Son (Gal $4^{4ff.}$) in whom Israel should find its fulfilment and hope (cf. 1 Co $15^{3f.}$, Ro 1^{1-4}). In conformity with precedent a mere remnant of Jews had accepted the gospel; nevertheless, Paul's kinsmen were still 'elect' and beloved of God for the sake of their forefathers (11^{28}).

But why had the people of the Law, led by their priests and recognized teachers, rejected the Messiah in the Person of Jesus? Was it because under their Law He was technically 'accursed' (Gal 3^{13})? That had been a difficulty for Paul *after* the Crucifixion. Jesus had been rejected as One who was neither a new Moses, a new David, or a new Zadok. His message of meekness, purity of heart, and loving one's enemies had been unacceptable; His claim to stand in a unique relationship to God His Father had sounded like blasphemy. And yet humble men and women, both Jew and Gentile, sinful men and women, Gentile and Jew alike, had seen in Jesus the very face of God (2 Co 4^{4-6}). Paul who had been a Pharisee knew what the dominant view of the Law was among the Jews who condemned Jesus, and he proclaimed that the work of Jesus had a peculiar effect on the whole set-up of religion as law.

III

The Pharisee kept himself apart as one who would observe to the letter each commandment contained in the Law, and each separate interpretation expounded by his scribes. If the rule said that a man must not break the sanctity of the seventh day, he would define every possible way of breaking it, and avoid them all. He accepted the inspired Scriptures of Moses and the prophets, and his own tradition also (cf Mk 7). He had a zeal for religion, and made it quite public (cf. Mt 23). The terms 'religious' and 'righteous' were simply equated for him. Speaking of his life as a Pharisee, Paul pronounced their verdict on it: 'blameless!' (Ph 3^{6}). There is no good reason to doubt that this is a fair statement of Pharisaic religion.

How different was the picture for one who knew the story of Jesus and Levi (Mk 2^{13-17}), or Jesus, Simon the Pharisee, and the woman off the streets (Lk 7^{36-50}); or had heard His parable about the tax collector and the Pharisee (Lk 18^{9-14}). Jesus had said, 'You must be more righteous than the righteous' (Mt 5^{20}). It was easy to be a Pharisee, but it seemed impossible to be a disciple of Jesus

who would be worthy to enter God's Kingdom (cf. Mk $10^{23ff.}$).

As a Christian who knew the humiliation of having to exchange places with the tax collector, Paul states in Romans his conviction that moral standards apply to every one, Gentile and Jew, either by natural law or by Mosaic *torah* (1–2); and he demonstrates that breaches of the Law are commonplace throughout the world as he knew it (as they are in to-day's world). His great premiss is that all men are involved in the first man's trespass ($5^{18f.}$) and, although the modern individualist will rush in to deny it, this is the truth. We are members together in the body of mankind; we affect one another spiritually and culturally. So a man must learn to talk the language of 'we' rather than that of 'me myself, my ego and I.' For the Jews in particular it had to be said that sin existed prior to the giving of their covenant law (5^{13}), but that the Law defined transgressions and the Divine wrath that inevitably would follow a trespass (4^{15}). Worse still, the demonic power that sin is can use even the Divine law to make worse an already terrible situation (5^{20}). Law exhibits the precise ways in which men defy God, and law properly understood produces the conviction of sin (7^{7}). Unfortunately the Law in itself does not effect both conviction of sin and a means of new life. Rather, it makes people self-righteous because they assume that religion, legalistically understood, binds God Himself. The Pharisee seemed to have satisfied all the Law's demands and was thus in a sense 'beyond God.'

It is with this situation that Paul deals in existential terms. He had himself been found out as a man guilty of illicit desire. If he were spotless on the outside, he was far from being so within. For the Law promoted external compliance, but it could not deal with that spiritual centre of the self where motives are generated and from which ambition spurts. It circumcised the flesh and left the heart untouched (2^{29}; cf. 2 Co 3^{3-6}). What must be said then? 'Christ is the end of the law!' (10^{4}). Jesus had brought to an end the system of legalistic religion, and in the light of the Cross Paul could now pronounce the Divine verdict on his own life, on my life, on any man's life: 'guilty!'

IV

God is righteous, but I am a sinner. The Law is spiritual, but 'I am carnal, sold under sin.' This means that 'me and my ego' cannot stand before God who is altogether holy. The 'I' is at once Paul and man as such. Man is a rebel without a cause like James Dean in the film of that title. Man is a slave of sin and falls under a just judgment (2^{4-11}).

Here Paul is speaking as if sin were the Devil in person, a power that tyrannizes over mankind in spite of their highest dreams and best moral efforts. The reality of this impasse is more important than the Apostle's imagery. Is mankind impotent? We all hate war and yet none of us has been able to stop it. We all want brotherly co-operation and partnership in this earth's natural resources; and yet the Mau Mau rebel against the nice British, the negro is lynched or castrated by the good Americans, and the advocates of *apartheid* go to church every Sunday. Europe should be federally united, but the politicians seem incompetent to cope with the entrenched evils of four hundred years of unbridled nationalism. Yes, man is an addict of sin. Whether we believe with the Apostle in the existence of Satan and his demons, we must recognize that he is speaking of realities and that there is a demonic dominion of evil that seems to hold mankind captive. That is why 'redemption' is necessary, and for Paul this has been accomplished once and for all in Christ crucified: one man died for all (4^{25}; 2 Co 5^{14}). Jesus has paid the price for the sins of His brethren, the sons of Adam, by becoming a sin-offering (2 Co 5^{21}). Jesus is the new Man in whose obedience to God all men may, by faith and love, be involved ($5^{18f.}$). The other side of this truth about the death of Jesus is that God accomplished it, God sent Him to die, God Himself provided the *hilasterion*, the personal means of reconciliation. God proved His power over sin and death in Jesus Christ ($3^{24f.}$ $8^{3f.}$). However paradoxical this sounds, it is nothing but the plain truth to those who have found themselves rescued from addiction by Divine grace.

The union with the new Man meant that the old Adam in man had to die, for by death alone is one set free from the Law's demands (7^{1-6}). This happened when the 'I' was dipped under the waters of baptism (6^{1-11}). A Christian therefore is one risen from the dead, a 'new creation,' 'one spirit' with the Lord and so assured of an inheritance in the Kingdom of God that is yet to be made perfect (Col 2^{12}, 2 Co 5^{17}, 1 Co 6^{17}, Col 5^{12}). But the future reference in salvation must not be overstressed, for Paul believed in a miracle that had happened: 'since we are justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ' (5^{1}). Joy is the twin of peace, and both spring from the power of the Holy Spirit that transforms men into Christlike children of God (5^{5} $8^{2.\ 6.\ 13-17}$ 14^{17}, 2 Co 3^{18}). Because they are the subjects of Christ the King, they have an eternal hope (Col $1^{13.\ 27}$).

Paul was certain about the sinfulness of man, since he was convicted of his own sin as a man of religion. In the seventh chapter of Romans he is

dramatizing to some extent his own condition under the images derived from Adam's story in Gn 3, but this Adam, however mythological he appears to us to-day, is no more mythical than the Ernest Pontifex who corrupts young Ernest in Butler's *The Way of All Flesh* (ch. 31) or the Erick of Marguerite Yourcenar's *Coup de Grâce* who tells us that 'Deep down within every one of us lurks an insolent, dull-witted cad' (p. 89). What is still more significant is that the seventh chapter of Romans is the writing of a Christian who has ceased fighting against God, who has come home to the Father's house, who knows that the entire moral law may be summed up in the word: 'You shall love your neighbour as yourself' (13^9). To say that 'the law is spiritual' is possible for the man who has known the meaning of God and his own responsibility; to affirm that 'I am carnal, sold under sin' is the confession of one who admits he is unworthy. In their context however, these two statements are the judgments on man apart from God's free grace of one who now rests in the sunshine of faith, at peace with God and girded for battle against spiritual forces in high places; a man who could say that he always carried in his body 'the death of Jesus, so that the life of Jesus might also be manifested in his mortal flesh' (2 Co 4^{10}; cf. 5^{4-10}). *Coup de grâce* indeed!

Evangelism To-Day

By the Reverend Canon E. Moore Darling, Coventry

There is no more important concern of the Church to-day than evangelism. Were I writing a new and ecclesiastical version of *J'Accuse*, my charge would be that by and large our clergy spend ninety per cent. of their time on ten per cent. of our people. Two vital facts must be put in as addenda to that accusation. First, the situation has been built up with deadly slowness so as to pass almost unnoticed, and, second, when the charge is made I am neither judge nor prosecuting counsel, but one of the accused—who immediately puts in a plea of guilty.

That brings me to a consideration which seems to me to be a vital one but which is often missed when we discuss evangelism. It is recognized that before we seek for remedies for what is usually referred to as 'the drift from the churches' we must trace the massive though subtle causes for that drift: before we seek to cure the widespread 'indifference' we must ask what it is that makes folk indifferent, and so on. What is often forgotten by us of organized religion (though never by the man in the street) is our *own frame of mind* as we examine the situation.

This need for a deep sense of penitence in the churches was brought home to me by the very first question I was asked at the first Service I ever took in an Inn. There were forty-odd men there and I preached the gospel to them as best I might, telling of Jesus born in Bethlehem, teaching and healing, crucified and risen, Jesus a power in the world to-day, Jesus not only a pattern for living but also all that a man may know of God. The sermon ended, glasses were filled, and I asked for questions. The first that came had evidently been prepared beforehand, and was a complete surprise. I had guessed at several likely opening questions but this was not among or even like them. 'How do you come to us?' I was asked. 'As one of the Godly with a message for sinners, or are we all in this together, sharing the blame? I accept your gospel, but the Church must take its share of the blame for the decay in church-going.' I replied that I prayed every day 'Almighty and most merciful Father we have erred and strayed from Thy ways like lost sheep,' that I earnestly meant it, and that we were, as he put it, all in this together. That happened at an Inn in Kenilworth exactly as I narrate it, and only confirmed a conviction that has been growing for years, *i.e.*, that the very beginning of evangelism is to go to folk as fellow-sinners.

This, may I say in all gentleness, is far from being always the official view, for only recently a high dignitary, and that a very human and lovable one, argued that we should discuss our ecclesiastical shortcomings only inside our own body, and not with the general public. I have even been accused of 'fouling my own nest,' when what I have really been doing is to try and learn not to foul His nest. Unless we go to folk as fellow-sinners we set up a barrier of self-righteousness which repels them and makes evangelism impossible. So it is that just as the outsider must accept his share of the blame for the impotence of Christendom so must we who are inside seek pardon for the distorted image of our Master which we have presented to the world. Then, and not till then, are we in a position to judge the past and plan the future.

Looking back to the beginning of the Industrial Revolution we can see three main reasons why we have alienated the common man. There are

no clear lines of demarcation between the three, for each shades into and interlocks with the other two, while all three together supply only the outlines of a very complicated pattern. For convenience we can summarize these main headings as theological, economic, and ecclesiastical, having to do with our ideas of God, of the life of man in human society, and of the relations of man with the Church of God.

From the time of Darwin to as late as in the early nineteen hundreds we first of all held on to an untenable position regarding Biblical criticism long after the thinking world was agreed on its conclusions. Even worse than that, after most of us had seen that belief in the verbal inspiration of Scripture was impossible to hold, we for the most part kept our new ideas to ourselves and carefully avoided passing them on to the man in the pew, so that even to-day he is often unaware of the fact that those old views have gone by the board.

Again, when the common man was struggling for political and economic freedom, in the main the Church was with the 'haves' against the 'have-nots.' The Trade Unions are far from having forgotten this even in A.D. 1958. Remember that many of the early Labour leaders belonged to such bodies as the Primitive Methodists much less because of the religious views of those bodies than because there they found some desire to relate religion to living and working conditions in field and factory, in mine and workshop.

What I have called the ecclesiastical factor is based on the fact that the Church of England had become the Church of a class, largely manned by members of that class—indeed entirely so in its 'upper reaches.' As one result we now find that our clergy mainly spend ninety per cent. of their time caring for ten per cent. of the population. Until that is altered any really massive evangelistic effort is hopeless.

Having analysed the guilt of organized religion into three main parts we may now look at these three strands in greater detail. First, let us consider the theological aspect, particularly as it concerns our view of the Old Testament.

Here there are two points at issue. The first is whether we do or do not accept the Old Testament as Divine truth regarding history, astronomy, biology, and so on. That is important, but I have never believed that it is anything like so vital as the question as to whether some of the acts of Jehovah as described in the Old Testament are consistent with God the Father in the Lord's Prayer, or with the Person and work of Jesus Christ our Lord.

My own view, and that of the vast majority of informed Christians to-day, on the first point is that while the Old Testament gives us a wonderful vision of the way in which man's idea of God developed down the ages, when it speaks of history, astronomy and biology its voice is *contemporary, i.e.* is based on human knowledge on the level which that knowledge had reached at the moment of writing. So it is that the second chapter of Genesis is poetry, not history or science to be taken literally. So, too, with the idea of the sun standing still in order that Joshua might have a little longer in which to slaughter his enemies. Not only is such a statement scientifically incredible, but it is also a theological absurdity, for that is not the *sort* of thing that our Father would do. Jehovah at the time of the Jewish conquest of Canaan is in character with such an act, but not our Father, while such a standard is no part of the gospel of Jesus Christ our Lord.

When young I was terrified by the story of the children who jeered at Elisha's baldness and who were slain by bears as a punishment. In my late teens I ceased to be terrified and became deeply shocked. My reaction was 'If God is like that He is no God for me.' You see, I had been taught that God was indeed like that. It was just this realization of plainly unethical conduct attributed to God that started me on a spell of protesting agnosticism—and I *know* that there were scores like me. It is true that some, having cleared their minds, came back to the Faith. Many did not, and they were far from always the worst or weakest.

Two other striking examples of Jehovah behaving in a way which appears shocking by our Christian standards are the burning of Korah, Dathan and Abiran *and their families* because of a ritual offence, and Jacob's shocking deception of his blind father. Such a standard is lamentably unchristian and we should say so plainly, openly, constantly. I do not suggest that we should forever be preaching on this topic, if only because there is so much of infinitely greater importance which cries aloud to be said from our pulpits. What I am insisting is that when occasion arises in sermons, in conversation, and in our personal ministry we of the clergy should never dodge the issue or give 'clouded counsel'—as was so often done in the past. Do you doubt that last sentence? Let me tell you that, coming away from an Army Religious Brains Trust where the above ground was covered, one of the best men on the Panel sadly remarked: 'If I repeated in my church what you've just said now I wouldn't last a week. I agree with you entirely, but mustn't say so.'

In many conversations on this subject of intellectual honesty, of telling the layman *all* the truth we know, I'm often asked 'Do you really

believe that the average working chap is kept away from religion for intellectual reasons?' My answer would always be, 'Occasionally, but in my experience only very rarely.' I believe that the damage is done in two different ways, so to speak on two entirely different levels.

First there is the direct loss, the clean-cut case of the educated youngster who (mistakenly) thinks he or she is called on to forsake religion because of a conscientious refusal to accept the standards of earlier books in the Old Testament as binding on Christians. That loss may not be very significant measured in numbers. It is deeply serious if your criterion be *human quality*, for these men and women are of just the sort to whom we ought to be looking for our future leaders. It is very easy for those of us who live our lives very much inside ecclesiastical circles to be unaware of these cases, but none of us who had experience of close contact with hundreds of young people in the Forces can fail to be painfully conscious of them, aware, too, of the fact that the references made here to the passages in the Old Testament which repel are known to and quoted by them.

In the case of the man in the street the process is much less clean-cut, far more blurred. He just doubts if the Bible is true because it has filtered down to him that 'they say' that it isn't. It forms part of the ideas that add up to the statement that 'religion has had it' whereas what has really 'had it' is a version of Christianity heavily adulterated by primitive ideas that are entirely alien to the true Faith. In just the same way the lovable, muddled, often crass but usually kindly, common man has vaguely heard that the physicist can explain life in terms of mere matter (in spite of the writings of Jeans and Eddington) and that anyhow the psychologists have debunked religion.

By and large we have two lines of reply. First, on all sorts of Panels, in the Press, in conversations, we must state our case in plain English and with courtesy. Second, and much more important, we must live up to what we teach.

We now come to the vital issue of our economic guilt, *i.e.* our failure to be Christians in the economic field. I think that this was first brought vividly home to me by that splendid person, the late Bishop Kempthorne, my old adored Bishop of Lichfield.

He told, as only he could, the story of how King Henry of Navarre was feasting after a great victory, won in spite of the fact that one wing of his cavalry never reached the battlefield. In the middle of the feasting its leader, Crillon, crashed into the Hall, booted, spurred, and bespattered with mud. Before the hapless Crillon could say a word, Henry shot to his feet, pointed a quivering finger at Crillon, and roared, 'Hang thyself, brave Crillon. We fought at Arques, and *you were not there.*' 'That,' said my Bishop, 'is what organized Labour says to-day as it points to us.' Alas, it continues to say it.

That is not all the case, for in addition to its assumption that a division into classes and masses, the rich and the poor, was part of the Divine ordering of the world, which somehow enabled it to be deaf to the economic claims of the disinherited, organized religion also failed completely during the Industrial Revolution to make any real contact, any understanding attempt to supply the *spiritual* needs of the masses.

Thus in his fine book, *Church and People in an Industrial City*, Canon Wickham points out that in Sheffield a population of nine thousand six hundred and ninety-five in 1736 had grown to eighty-three thousand four hundred and forty-nine by 1851 and stands at half a million to-day. The first stage of the growth saw a drift from the 'free seats' in the Church of England to the Chapels which at first provided a fellowship for working folk. Then, as the Wesleyans became 'respectable,' splinter groups were formed to which many Trade Union leaders belonged. To-day Labour goes its own way, apart from the Church of England and the Free Churches.

Canon Wickham points to a fact which many commentators on the drift have failed to see, *i.e.*, that, at least in places like Sheffield, it is not true to say that the Church of England has lost the working people, the fact being that it never had them. What it has lost is, of course, the middle classes, and, also, in my experience, particularly the more intelligent members of that section of our community.

Thus it is that our sins in not facing up to the economic implications of Christianity, and also allowing ourselves to be very largely (though I hope decreasingly) a Church where members of the middle classes are trained to minister to their own class, has lost us thousands of our best folk, not only among working people who either resent or are indifferent to the whole situation, but also among the best of our University-educated folk. In their case the trouble is an acute realization that this situation of a class church is a travesty of what the Church of God was meant to be. That they have come back is due to the Church reviving.

Redressing the evil is likely to be difficult, and certain to be slow. First, of course, we must realize that Christians must bear their share of the blame for the existence of a human society which, up to recently, was unchristian in its very essence. That does not mean that all the clergy must be politicians and economists. It does

mean that while we go on teaching that man cannot live by bread alone, we should also be keen to see that the under-dog gets his fair share of whatever bread is going. Fifty years ago such an idea would have been a trifle advanced. To-day it is commonplace and to go on emphasizing the economic responsibility is largely flogging a dead horse, for have we not got the Welfare State? I believe that to-day a far deeper obstacle to evangelism is the fact that the Church of England is a *class church*, in contacts, in mental outlook, in vocabulary, and certainly in government. To get that last point you have only to skim Crockford and look at the background and academic careers of our Bishops and Deans! *Of course* they are able men, but they come of one class, they have the background, speak the language of that class, and between them and the common man there is a great gulf fixed of which I believe that many of them are wholly and absolutely unaware!

What this means in terms of evangelism can be seen in two cases (far enough back to make identification, and consequent hurt, impossible) of religion on the air. A very scholarly don preached a sermon which would have been admirable to a High Matins congregation, say in Bournemouth. To a man from the factory bench it was—meaningless. Later from a Scotsman and his folk (not of my church as the don was) we heard about Christ in a way that no man could misunderstand. Its simple, classless sincerity just *glowed*.

Again, one of our greatest scholars as a member of a Brains Trust just had no contribution to make. The lay members were not speaking his language, few listeners would understand him, and, if he alone had been answering, the questioners would have remained hungry sheep who looked up and were not fed.

Admittedly, many of our Church leaders are acutely alive to the whole situation: admittedly a very great deal has been done even in the last decade to remedy the position. The point is that we have not gone fast enough nor far enough in implementing the conviction held by an increasing number of us, *i.e.*, that we no longer dare go on using ninety per cent. of our man-power caring for ten per cent. of our folk.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Holy Spirit

By Principal J. Ithel Jones, M.A., B.D.,
The Baptist College, Cardiff

Not being an Englishman myself, some of the expressions used by English people seem to me very strange. And not to me only. There is the report about an Australian who remarked how strange it was that an Englishman came into the room, pointed to an empty chair and asked, 'Is any one sitting there?' Yes; it does make you think, doesn't it? There are other words and expressions in English that seem very strange to me. I haven't the time to go after them now.

You would feel exactly the same about the Welsh language, I think. There are strange little turns of speech which people who speak the language every day of their lives scarcely notice. There is, for example, the Welsh phrase for 'Holy Spirit.' We say 'Ysbryd Glân,' which translated literally would be 'Clean Spirit.'

I should like us to think about that for a while on this Whitsunday. It is a perfectly good thing that Welsh people call the Holy Spirit the 'Clean' Spirit, for everything about Him is clean. This very Sunday on which we remember His coming is called 'White' Sunday. And rightly so. For, the first disciples whose dark and gloomy thoughts were banished at the coming of the Holy Spirit must have thought of it as a 'white' day. And when this day became a favourite day for baptism into the Christian faith those being baptized wore white garments. The result is that everything about the day makes us think of white.

The 'Clean Spirit,' then, is a fitting name for the Holy Spirit. If only we open our hearts to Him He will make us clean through and through. We might well learn one of the petitions contained in a great and lovely prayer of the Christian Church: 'Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit.'

'Anon'

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'For whosoever would save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake and the gospel's shall save it.'—Mk 8^{35} (R.V.).

Some poems, you will have noticed, are written by a man called 'Anon.' If you don't know who he is, the Gospels have several sayings of Jesus which may help you to find out. But first let us hear a story.

Once, the tale goes, a Swiss pastor was taken ill in the mountains. He was discovered by a stranger who went out of his way to help the sick

man and eventually saw him right home. When he was indoors and warm, the sick man tried to pay the stranger for his trouble and expense. But the man waved his offer aside. 'At least tell me your name,' the pastor asked, 'so that I may remember you in my prayers.' The stranger laughed and, as he left the house, he said, 'Can you tell me the name of the Good Samaritan?' The sick man never knew who had helped him.

The trouble with most of us is that we want to label our good deeds. We are quite prepared to do a good turn. In fact, some of us who wear a certain kind of uniform make a vow that we will do one each day. But we must never let that very laudable object become a matter of pride. The good deeds we do will be much less good if we go about swelling out our chests and advertising the fact that we are Doers of Good Deeds. The true followers of Jesus are those who help because there is need, not because there is a chance of being noticed. Jesus Himself spent much of the precious time of His ministry in healing and helping; but He never used those occasions to prove how really He was God's Messiah, and He never said that He was too busy to help because He ought to be teaching. He often took people away out of the crowds, so that His good deeds should not become known.

Admiral Byrd, the American Antarctic explorer, tells how three of his colleagues, Innes-Taylor, Moody and Dane, who were experts with sledges, spent a whole arctic winter preparing their special gear for the final push south. But, when the time came, it was clear that a small party with tractors had much better chances of reaching their objective than a large one with sledges. So these three men came to the leader and volunteered to stand down, though they had looked forward to the adventure with tremendous eagerness. Byrd, writing about it, says: 'I would rather find such bigness in my associates than discover a mountain range.'

But it is a bigger thing even than that. Jesus taught in our text that life can only be lived to the full if it is lived without thought of ourselves. The Pharisees spent their time trying to do the right thing so that God would be pleased with them. Jesus said that was a game they were bound to lose. The man who really wins is he who is not worrying about himself but only about the task to be done.

Do you know about the Japanese robber who at length died and was sent down to the infernal regions? Centuries afterwards the Buddha paid a visit to those places, and the robber begged him to take him to some brighter place. The Buddha asked him, 'Can you remember any good deed you ever did on earth that might help you now?' The robber searched his memory, and eventually recalled that once, when he was going through a wood, there was a spider in his path and, instead of treading on it, he carefully lifted it out of his way.

The Buddha passed on. But presently the miserable robber saw a silken thread hanging before his eyes. Looking up, he saw it was a huge spider's web. He tested it with his hard hands and, to his great surprise, found that it would bear his weight. With panting heart, he began to climb, and climbed on and up until he felt the cool breeze and saw the light of the sun. He would be free at last from the dark abode!

In his excitement he looked back to the pit from which he had come and saw to his horror that dozens of other inhabitants of the black abode were climbing up after him. At once a great fear shook him. The slender thread could not possibly bear them all. 'Get back!' he yelled. 'Get back, all of you. It's mine!' No sooner had he said those words than the spider's thread snapped, and he tumbled back to the place where, you see, he really belonged.

That isn't a Christian story, as you have noticed. But it gets very near to the great Christian truth which is taught in our text. You see what I mean? Good deeds ought to be anonymous. It isn't the name of the doer they ought to bear, but the Name in which they are done.

So now you know who wrote the poems.

The Christian Year

Whitsunday

The Implications of Whitsuntide

By the Very Reverend George Johnstone Jeffrey, D.D., Glasgow

'Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?' —Ac 19^2 (R.V.).

Here is an incident of warm human interest and of real value for Christian living to this day. In his journeyings Paul comes across a small group of Christians bravely holding together in alien surroundings. Their spirit was fervid but somehow there was something lacking in it. With unerring discernment the apostle pierces to the roots of this deficiency. 'Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?' he asks. With a candour Paul would welcome, they reply, 'The Holy Ghost! We never heard of the Holy Ghost.' The end of the story is exhilarating. God uses the preaching of His servant to give these earnest people a Pentecost all to themselves. They received a baptism of the spirit that brought wondrous release. They passed from a maimed and leaden witness into one that was contagious and lyrical.

With this incident in our minds let us reinterpret the message of Whitsunday.

Did you receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed? What would be the reaction to this question of many to-day who feel that *their religion has somehow lost its savour?* Were they honest, they would be fain to confess that the best they hope for is to be able to walk and not faint. They would never dream of mounting up with wings as eagles. What is the root of this pedestrian inexpectancy? There are those whose idea of the Holy Spirit is vague to the point of unreality. Partly, this may spring from a reverence before a mystery too deep for words. But in most cases it arises from the belief that the gift of the Holy Spirit is for the few, a kind of perquisite for finished saints, or a technical term for theologians! Nothing could be further from the mind of Christ. It cannot be too often stressed that the best He has is for every man. If a son ask bread, fish—these are not the *luxuries* of life, they are its *staple necessities*. 'If a son shall ask bread . . . how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?'

To return to our story. Three changes can be discerned in the experience of these imprisoned disciples who had found Divine deliverance. First there was *a new understanding of the grounds of salvation*. Up till now they had been living under the dispensation of John the Baptist—that brave spirit. They were living in a climate that was prepentecostal. The baptism into John's faith had made them perfervid men, full of self-discipline and the will towards stern renunciation, to the last limits of asceticism. But with all their efforts these were labours of Sisyphus. Their dreams of self-mastery ended in a weary trail of defeat. So has it always been. So shall it ever be. If holy vows, stark austerities, self-scourging self-denials can save a man there would have been no need for the gospel. It stands written for all time—'By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: It is the gift of God.' To how many million struggling, baffled, souls down the ages have these words been the Great Enfranchisement? Out of countless testimonies let us cite but one. Thomas Chalmers was smitten with a long, trying illness. Lying on his back he glimpsed a new conception of the gospel that changed the whole tenour of his life and revolutionized his message. It sounds like sweet music. 'I have learned,' he wrote, 'that on the system of "Do this and live" no peace can ever be attained. It is "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." When this belief enters the heart, joy and confidence enter with it. The righteousness which we try to work out for ourselves eludes our impotent grasp. The righteousness which by faith we put on secures our acceptance with God so that we are enabled to do with aid from on high what we could never do without it. We look to God in a new light. We see Him as a reconciled Father. That love to Him which terror scares away re-enters the heart and with a new principle and a new power we become new creatures in Christ Jesus.'

The second thing that happened to this earnest group was that *a religion that had become dull, static, unadventurous, now became joyously progressive*. There are so many strained, weary faces among Christians. Their lives seem to consist in repeating themselves like a decimal. Life becomes an affair of wearing out our boots. Our religion becomes a burden to ourselves and has certainly no contagion for the outsider. These people in the story had a pentecostal experience that changed their walk with God from a dreary trudge to a new life that went from strength to strength—a new bracing ascent towards heights with rewarding vistas. For to the hardy climber

Hills peep o'er hills, and Alps on Alps arise.

One could be doing with this kind of romance and expectancy in religious experience to-day—'the rapture of the forward view'—the past not a dead weight but a springboard to new, thrilling experiences of the grace of God.

I often regale myself with the 'swagger and bounce' of the song sung by the American workmen who had completed the miracle which is the Panama Canal.

> Don't send us back to a life that is flat again
> We who have shattered a continent's spine.
> Office work? Oh but we couldn't do that again.
> Haven't you something that's more in our line?
> Got any river they say isn't crossable?
> Got any mountains that can't be cut through?
> We specialize in the wholly impossible
> Doing things 'nobody ever could do.'

A little more of this spirit in our Christian witness and our influence would increase a hundredfold. Why the constant cry even in the Old Testament 'O sing unto the Lord *a new song*'? How stale our witness must become at times to God Himself. 'I bought it for an old song' is a significant phrase. Even God tires of an old song. The prophet rounds on the folk whose experience of God never got beyond the fact that He had delivered them out of Egypt and the house of bondage. That is an old story now. Behold, *God will do a new thing* is his message to weary-hearted men who did not know that they were on the eve of a new thrilling return from exile. Something like this should be the experience of the spirit-filled life. Mid-life should be richer and

deeper than youth. And age should have many a glimpse of the King in His beauty and the land that may not be very far off. There is no event lying ahead of us for which God's measureless resources of grace will not be made sufficient for us. It was with this in his mind that the Psalmist looked down the coming years and exclaimed, 'Oh how great is thy goodness, which thou hast laid up for them that fear thee.'

Lastly, after their baptism of the Spirit this group of men had *a new belief in the reality of God's guidance*. The apostle had not merely sauntered into their company that day by chance. In this event as in all the events of his career he had been 'led by the spirit,' had 'journeyed by revelation.' This is the hallmark of all who 'have received the Holy Ghost when they believed.' Such a sense of Divine guidance through life's shoals and perils suffuses our hearts at times with awesome gratitude. Even the most chequered lives bear witness to One continually and patiently seeking an entrance into our lives to control and direct them if we will. There is a memorable scene in Hardy's *Mayor of Casterbridge*. It is where Michael Henchard was plucked back from the pool in which he meant to plunge to his death by the sight of his own effigy lying stiff and stark upon the surface of the stream. 'Who is such a reprobate as I?' he was heard to mutter. 'And yet it seems that even I be in Somebody's hand!' We, too, are convinced that for life and death we are in Somebody's hand, never more sure of God's guidance and protection than when we are unconscious of it. From the heart we can sing—

> Supreme in wisdom as in pow'r
> the Rock of ages stands;
> Though him thou canst not see, nor trace
> the working of his hands.

If our lives have no lift at times and our feet drag wearily it were well to go into the presence of God and ask for a new baptism of the Spirit and like this little group of men long years ago we may find a blessed release from weariness to hope, from the dull life of convention to the life that thrills with spiritual adventure and to a deeper assurance of a Hand that guides us and a Heart that plans.

TRINITY SUNDAY

God is Love

BY PRINCIPAL H. F. LOVELL COCKS, M.A., D.D.
BRISTOL

'God is love.'—1 Jn 4^{8}.

Throughout all ages this simplest and shortest of the Christian creeds has been challenged from every side. In face of the disasters and bitterness of life, how can we believe that the sovereign power over this tumultuous, dangerous world is a loving God? In the early centuries of our era Christian thinkers had to meet the same challenge to their faith. For them as for us hard facts seemed to give the lie to their creed. But they had also to face specious solutions of the problem of pain and evil which denied that God is love by denying the Incarnation. We shall not be far from the mark if we say that the doctrine of the Trinity was the weapon they forged to defend the belief of simple Christians that God is love. This does not mean that Christians who do not understand the doctrine of the Trinity are dependent on the theologians and Christian philosophers for their right to trust in Christ and in the loving Father who sent Him for the salvation of the world. Nothing could be further from the truth than that. Faith is not assent to doctrines we do not understand but our personal committal to Christ. It is our faith and not our scepticism which prompts the questions theologians try to answer. Yet the questions are there. If the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are all three to be called God, are there then three gods? And if that is unthinkable, are the three 'persons' of the Trinity no more than the names we give to the three ways in which the one God has revealed Himself to men? But in that case it seems that Christ is only a temporary appearance of God on the stage of history—as though God were like an actor who plays in succession three different parts. Evidently the word 'person' does not mean 'personality,' which would give us three gods instead of God, yet it must mean more than a mode or aspect in which God reveals Himself to us. We cast about for analogies to illustrate these three distinctions within the Godhead. But all our analogies fail us. They lean to one side or the other of that middle course the doctrine tries to steer. The inner life of the Godhead necessarily transcends the reach of our finite minds. It is not surprising that our keenest and profoundest thought fails to plumb the mystery of God's being. But this does not mean that the doctrine of the Trinity is an airy speculation of presumptuous minds. If it fails to give an answer to faith's question which completely satisfies us, at least it rules out of court certain seductive but wrong answers to that question. So far from being mere theory, it is a most practical necessity. It has proved itself a powerful safeguard of our belief that God is love.

1. *God* is love. In the early centuries of Christian history the faith of believers was assailed by two particularly dangerous heresies. The first was Gnosticism. The Gnostic thinkers preached

what they claimed was a gospel of redemption. The problem of the contradiction between the love of God in Christ and the pain and evil of the world they solved by explaining that the creator of the world of matter in which the spirit of man languishes as in a prison is not the God and Father of Jesus Christ—not the God who is love—but an altogether inferior deity, even a demon. The Church was not slow to see that besides making nonsense of the Biblical witness this doctrine struck at the heart of the simple believer's assurance of salvation in Christ. Unless the God revealed in Christ is also the Creator and Lord of the world, we have no assurance of the final victory of Divine love over sin and death. Creator and Redeemer are one God whose name is Love.

But *how* is God in Christ? According to the Bible it is the Word of God who becomes incarnate in Jesus. But the second dangerous heresy, Arianism, declared that this Word of God is not the eternal Son of the Father, but merely the first and highest of the creatures. This, too, though in a subtler way, denied that God is love. For if the Word of God is not the only-begotten Son who is one with the Father, but only a created power, how can our redemption be secure? No creature can redeem us; and only one who is 'true God of true God' can assure us that from all eternity God is love. Similarly, if the Holy Spirit also is merely a creature—as a later heresy maintained—then the same conclusion follows. No creature can regenerate us or shed abroad in our hearts the love of God. It was to meet these fatal errors that the Church fashioned the doctrine of the Trinity, in order that the faith of humble, unlettered Christians might be defended against teachings which tore Christianity away from its roots in the Biblical witness and threatened to turn it into just another pagan religion.

2. God is *love*. To say that God is love is to say far more than that God is loving. We may say of a man that he is loving. But our human capacity for loving does not find fulfilment except in our relationships with other personalities existing outside ourselves. God is not subject to this limitation. He is *love*. That is to say He possesses in Himself from all eternity those enrichments which we gain only in our relationships with other selves. Love in its fulness implies the Lover, the Beloved, and the mutual love between them, and it is this fullness of Divine love to which the doctrine of the Trinity points as the very being of the Godhead.

To put it in another way: God did not have to create the world in order to find an object for His love. He was not lonely before the creation. Neither did He create us because He needed personal beings like ourselves on whom to lavish His love. It is true that *our* love is rooted in our need for one another; for in isolation we are and must remain incomplete and unsatisfied. Thus there is inevitably an element of desire—even of self-seeking—in our human love which reaches out to embrace another self. But God's love is different. We have been created by that love, yet our creation is the result not of Divine need but of Divine superfluity or over-flowing. God's love is thus free, sovereign and unconstrained. It is as self-less as our love is self-centred. It seems a far cry from the simple creed 'God is Love' to the doctrine of the Trinity; but when we say that the gospel is the good news of the free, unbought love of God for sinners, revealed to us in Christ and His Cross and shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit, we are affirming the truth to which the Trinitarian doctrine bears witness. The doctrine is baffling to our intellects, yet the mystery of the triune God is none the less an affirmation of our faith. And what our finite minds cannot comprehend our humble and grateful hearts may yet adore.

First Sunday after Trinity

When Jesus Refused to Take Advice

By the Reverend James Martin, B.D., Glasgow

'Get thee behind me, Satan.'—Mt 16^{23}.

Most of us are constitutionally unwilling to accept advice and, in consequence, sometimes run ourselves into trouble that might have been avoided. But there is another side to this, for at times the advice that is offered us will be bad advice and we do well to ignore it then. Nowhere must we be more on our guard than with respect to those things that pertain to the Kingdom of God and our service of the Christ. Not infrequently, when it is a matter of Christian duty that perplexes us, our friends may give advice that is not really good. In their concern for our welfare they judge things not by God's standards but by the world's and urge on us a course of action which they honestly reckon the best calculated for our 'getting on,' but all the time they are assessing 'getting on' in terms of money, fame and position and not in terms of obedience to Christ. We must, therefore, take care lest our friends on occasion, with the best of intentions, advise us wrongly.

Jesus had to exercise this very same care. More than once friends urged advice upon Him that had an attractive appearance and which they believed was in His best interests, yet Jesus would not take it because He counted it bad advice. And events always proved Him right.

1. There was that time, for one, when the people mobbed Him beside the Sea of Galilee and wanted to make Him King. Although the narrative does not explicitly tell us, we may be sure that Jesus' intimate friends urged Him to take the chance. And what a chance! The people were in the hollow of His hand, His to do with as He willed. He could be King on the instant and what an opportunity that would be. He could effect a complete transformation in the country in a single life-time, working a social revolution and creating a new order. He could do it all right, there was no doubt of that, and this would help on the Kingdom of God a great deal quicker than His present slow methods were doing.

But Jesus refused to listen, pushed aside the proffered crown and persisted in His chosen course. Jesus knew that His mission could not be accomplished simply by social revolution, although He knew, too, that the accomplishment of His mission must lead to social reform. So, indeed, it turned out. The transforming of human hearts by the grace of Christ has led to far-reaching social changes, the abolition of slavery, the elevation of the status of women, and many more. The changes come often much too slowly but they come and they abide. Jesus knew that there was little use in changing the outward structure of things if human hearts were left the same, just as He knew that changed hearts must lead in time to social changes. And so He would not listen to those who would have Him be King.

Nor is He listening now. There are still those who urge Him so, who cajole the Church to stop concerning itself with other things and go in exclusively for social reform. 'Be political' is their cry. 'That is how to fulfil the Church's mission.'

'Be political?' Of course the Church (and its members) must be political, if to be political is to be concerned with political things, with government and housing and peace, and to exert every effort to set wrong things right. But if to be political means to see in politics the be-all and end-all of our purpose and the panacea for all our ills, it will not do. Still to-day, as in Jesus' own time, if wrong things are to be put right, then bad men must be made good and good men better.

2. There was that time, too, when Nicodemus came to Jesus and offered Him advice. 'You will have to modify your approach,' he protested, 'if you are going to get anywhere with your preaching. You are far too theological with all this talk of conversion. Just you stick to your Sermon on the Mount and you will get on far better.'

But Jesus would have none of it. He knew that His ethic was a religious ethic. The Sermon on the Mount set up the signposts that marked out the road of right living. But only the religion embodied in Jesus' own life and work could supply the dynamic required to follow that road. So Jesus did not heed Nicodemus's advice.

Nor is He heeding that same advice to-day. The teaching of Jesus cannot be separated from the religion of Jesus. John Owen the Puritan tells in one of his sermons of a man who had on his hands a dead body which for the moment he wished to pass off as alive. So he propped it on a seat, but it fell. Again he propped it up and again it fell. Ruefully he murmured, '*Oportet esse aliquid intus*—it needs something inside it.' The man who tries to follow out the ethic of Jesus while ignoring the religion of Jesus is one of whom the same is to be said.

3. There was, further, that time when Peter took the Master to task and strongly counselled Him to drop all talk of the Cross. It was a crazy, reckless notion which would mean the finish of the whole adventure. He must put all such ideas out of His head and steer clear of danger rather than move boldly into it as He proposed doing. What was more, such talk of hardship and difficulty and peril would be calculated to scare off likely recruits. 'You'll need to stop it,' Peter argued. 'It will spoil everything.'

But Jesus would pay no heed. He knew that the only way to save the world was to die for it. And as for scaring off likely recruits, there, also, Peter was wrong. He had not been scared off, had he? Nor would any one who was worth anything at all. Jesus believed that there was more gallantry in the human soul than Peter was prepared to admit. And Jesus knew, too, that it was only when a man was prepared to shoulder a cross for His sake that he would enjoy life to the full. So is it still.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Preaching and Hearing[1]

BY THE REVEREND R. W. STEWART, D.D., GLASGOW

'How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? . . . Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.'—Ro 10^{14-17}.

The essential reality in religion, the unbroken thread of continuity in the Church, is the Word of the living God awaking a response in the hearts of men. A church is a place suitably designed and furnished for the preaching and the hearing of the Word. Unless that goes on within its walls

[1] The first Sunday evening sermon in the new Parish Church of Killermont.

its function is not fulfilled. Let us think of preaching and hearing.

1. *Preaching.* To preach Jesus Christ is to do more than mention or discuss Him; it is to speak for Him with eager conviction as one whom it is urgent for men to know if they are to be rescued from their sins and delivered from doubts and fears and stand redeemed and free.

One way to preach Jesus is to tell the way of life He lived on earth. An English merchant who visited Scotland in 1650 reported afterwards about Scots' preaching. 'I went to Irvine where I heard a well-favoured proper old man with a long beard, David Dickson, and that man showed me all my heart. I went to St. Andrews where a majestic-looking man called Blair showed me the majesty of God. After him I heard a little fair man named Rutherford and he showed me the loveliness of Christ.'

There were centuries before the Reformation when the picture of Christ was of the King and Judge to come, and centuries after it when attention to Jesus was distracted and smothered by academic arguments concerning the mystery of the Incarnation and the logic of salvation. In these times it must have been hard for people to appreciate, for example, Paul's description of the utter unselfishness of Jesus' life when he said 'even Christ pleased not himself'; or Peter's short summary of Jesus' life, 'he went about doing good'; or what John meant when he wrote, 'the Word became flesh and we beheld his glory'; or how the writer to the Hebrews was so impressed by the brotherhood of Christ with man that he said of Him, He was 'in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin.' In the nineteenth century it was like a breath of fresh air blowing in through the window when liberal theology, with its concern with history, created a wave of interest in Jesus of Nazareth. To-day ignorant people need to be told, and people who know reminded that Jesus, the gentle Jesus, was at times moved to fiery indignation and sickened by pretence and cant, that He was friendly and infinitely compassionate and hopeful about people who seemed utterly degraded; that He was humble—He washed His disciples' feet. Even if there is something right and important in modern emphasis on doctrine, on Biblical theology, on the Church and its sacraments, the preacher must not forget to tell people about Jesus.

Religion is kept simple and practical and a comfort and help for plain folk when men are reminded of the way Jesus walked on earth. To preach in this way is one of the duties of a minister, and to welcome such preaching the privilege of a congregation.

Another way to preach Jesus is to preach about His Cross, proclaiming it in the light of His teaching and example as the climax and fulfilment of His mission. In this respect the death of Jesus is in sharp contrast to other tragedies of history to which it might be compared. By the hands of assassins Julius Caesar and Abraham Lincoln died, like Him, at the height of power and opportunity. In both cases it seems a futile and pathetic accident of fate. To preach Jesus and Him crucified is to declare that His death was no accident but a design and destiny to reveal the love and wisdom and power of God for man's salvation.

And to preach Jesus is to proclaim that He is Risen, alive again and present to each new generation. To speak of His life and death is to lead back to two thousand years ago. If that were all there was to say the gospel would be growing steadily more out of date. But the preacher's message is not only back to Jesus of Nazareth, back to the Cross, but to look up to the Lord who lives and reigns and says, 'Lo, I am with you alway,' who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

2. *Hearing.* What is the right way to listen? For one thing, with a receptive mind. Many minds are poorly furnished, and any noble thoughts they may have entertained lie buried beneath a litter of trivial concerns.

Man grows in character and capacity when a great idea enters and dominates his outlook. By one phrase—'justification by faith'—Luther, it has been said, changed the politics of most of Europe. When Abraham Lincoln put into words two great ideas, 'This government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free' and 'government of the people, by the people, for the people,' these ideas became guiding principles for America. Now there is no surer way to discover or recover inspiring truths than by listening to the Word of God. The prophet Hosea proclaimed that God is love. Paul says that love is the fulfilling of the law. The hearer who opens his mind to such ideas receives thoughts that will flame like a torch within him and ennoble and direct his soul.

How to listen? Another answer is with a beating heart.

Paul Tillich, perhaps the most outstanding American theologian to-day, was telling a friend about a long evening of religious talk he had had with a Russian lady. 'It is astonishing,' he said, 'she has no *Angst*.' *Angst*, anxiety or anguish, the word is used in a special sense of religious anxiety, doubt, fear, misery, misgiving about the great unknown. It seems that there are those who have quite easy minds, untroubled by any sense of mystery or fear of judgment, yet as Marghanita Laski said on TV the other day, it is true that man knows himself lonely and sinful,

and certain to die, and then she admitted wistfully that, if one were sure it was true, religion would be a great comfort. Listen then with a heart beating with anxiety, but then beating with expectation to the Word of God.

During the Indian Mutiny a hundred years ago, the defenders of Lucknow were surrounded and in sore straits thinking themselves doomed. It is told that one day a Highland girl among them suddenly exclaimed, 'I hear the pipes.' First to her quick ear alone, then distinctly to those listening anxiously beside her came the far-off chanting of the bagpipes of the approaching army of relief. Listen to the gospel with a beating heart as to the music of deliverance, good news of the mighty acts of God.

Principal Caird's Gifford Lectures were entitled *The Fundamental Ideas of Christianity*. A little unfairly, yet with truth, one critic said that the title was wrong. It is not ideas that are fundamental in Christianity but facts; the facts that Jesus lived and taught and died and rose again. Listen then not only with a mind open to ideas but with a heart that beats as it hears the old old story of Jesus and His love. Not in cold blood but with tears for life's sinful yesterdays and with kindling hope for its morrow will every man listen who listens rightly to the proclamation of the forgiving love and redeeming power of God in Jesus Christ.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

The Christian Pilgrimage

(A sermon for Confirmation)

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. RIACH, B.D., EDINBURGH

Dearly beloved, I beseech you as . . . pilgrims.'—1 P 2^{11}.

When John Bunyan had written *The Pilgrim's Progress* he showed the manuscript to several friends. Without exception they informed him that while they were impressed by the work he should not venture to publish it. Convinced that he had been inspired by God to write this allegory, Bunyan scorned all advice and published the piece: and what a mercy he did! Not only has he provided the world with one of the greatest religious classics of all time, but he has brought home to men in an unforgettable fashion that the Christian life is a pilgrimage. When Principal John Baillie was invited to speak to the intellectuals of a Scottish University in an endeavour to impress them with the Christian Faith he could think of no better title for his talks than, *Invitation to Pilgrimage*. And, when we turn to Peter, who is writing as a Christian leader to a persecuted young Church, he does not hesitate to call his readers 'pilgrims'; and, in doing so, he is only reiterating one of the great truths that he had learned from the Lord and Master he loved, that the Christian life is a pilgrimage. Study the New Testament and it is discovered that there are three important stages in the pilgrimage of every Christian.

1. The first important stage in the Christian pilgrimage is baptism. The Baptist Church does not believe in what is erroneously called 'adult' baptism; but it does believe profoundly in 'believer's' baptism. Baptists are of the firm conviction that it is only when people have reached the stage when they can think for themselves and, of their own volition, declare that they believe in Jesus Christ as Saviour that they have any title to baptism. One can understand the merits of the Baptists' standpoint. But, with all due deference to it, do they not take too cognitive a view of baptism? They regard it too much as a matter of belief. To them baptism is primarily the symbol that a person understands and accepts certain truths of the Christian Faith. We in the churches who practise infant baptism are concerned more with its causative side. We believe that in baptism God goes into action and something significant happens. He bestows His saving grace upon the baptized person. How grateful, therefore, we all ought to be when in our infancy our parents have us baptized in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, the first step in our Christian pilgrimage.

2. The second stage in the Christian pilgrimage is joining the communicant membership of the Church. From ancient liturgies which have come down to us it is obvious that in the Early Church Holy Communion was celebrated every Sunday. The service was divided into two distinct parts. The first portion was called the liturgy of the catechumens, and comprised largely the reading of the Word and the sermon. The second part was termed the liturgy of the Upper Room, which consisted of the celebration of the Lord's Supper. At that point in the service all catechumens had either to withdraw or become spectators. This is the lot of all young people who have not joined the full membership of the Church. At best they can be mere onlookers of Holy Communion and not participants. To some, this may seem little loss: but, is it? In one of his issues of *The Morning Watch*, that man of genius, Struthers of Greenock, depicts a crowd of children immersed in an exciting ball game and standing by, on her crutches, a crippled girl. There is a look of longing in her eyes, and beneath the cartoon the caption, 'patient in tribulation.' There is all the difference in the world between watching a game and participating in it. What do the onlookers know of the thrilling experience, the emotions, the physical effort of the participants? Nothing!

It is no less with Holy Communion. In partaking of the sacramental bread and wine we experience benefits which no onlooker knows anything about. We do not merely remember but relive the whole drama of Calvary over again and, seeing sin as God sees it, have repentance roused in us. A fresh wave of God's redeeming grace sweeps over us to cleanse us. We encounter the dynamic presence of Christ. We have our fellowship with other members of the Christian family deepened. How thankful, therefore, we should be to God when He moves us to confirm the vows of our baptism and enter the full membership of the Church: for partaking of Holy Communion is the second big step in the Christian pilgrimage.

3. The third stage in the Christian pilgrimage is to reach Christian maturity. In the realm of literature there is a whole line of 'might have beens'—people who showed great literary promise and never fulfilled it. Look at Coleridge. What talent! What imagination! He planned great works, and was capable of achieving them, but, because of a fatal weakness, accomplished none of them and left behind him only a handful of poems. This is the tragedy which is repeated a million times over in the Christian Church. Young people, full of promise, are inspired to answer the call of God to join the full membership of the Church, but they somehow never reach Christian maturity. They never mature in their knowledge of the Christian Faith until they become like the layman who declared that, as a result of twenty-five years of church-going, he felt qualified to lecture on all the main doctrines of the Faith. They never mature in character by acquiring the great positive virtues which make human life to be great, like that covenanter Scott describes, who, in his early days, was full of negative qualities, but with the acquiring of the great positive virtues of love, sympathy, and good cheer had his very countenance changed. They never mature in initiative until, like Heine's father, they acquire a kind of spiritual antennae which tells them the Christian thing to do in every new situation which confronts them in an ever-changing world. They never mature in their attitude to death, remaining terrified of it all their days, like Dr. Johnson, instead of being able to meet it with steady eyes. Call this process of maturing in the Christian Faith sanctification, the New Birth, or by any other theological term you care, it is the third important stage in the Christian pilgrimage which should be the aim of us all to attain—as did Peter: for the Peter of the Gospels is an entirely different person from the mature Peter of the Epistles who regarded every believer in Jesus Christ as one with a pilgrimage to make.

Recent Foreign Theology

Bullinger and Predestination. The theological controversies of the sixteenth century have died down, and the issues that are discussed to-day are quite other. There are still many who cling to the doctrine of predestination in some form, and the present writer once met it in the extreme form of a man who was completely indifferent to the conversion of his own daughter on the ground that if she were predestined to salvation she would be saved, and if not his prayers could make no difference. The Swiss scholar Peter Walser has rendered good service by a thoroughgoing study of the teaching of the once redoubtable Bullinger on predestination, in the setting of his view of God.[1] This is a large and well documented work, resting on a first-hand study of the sources, and also on a thorough acquaintance with a considerable literature on Bullinger and his contemporaries. As a contribution to the history of Reformation doctrine, this is a valuable study.

[1] *Die Prädestination bei Heinrich Bullinger im Zusammenhang mit seine Gotteslehre* (*Studien zur Dogmengeschichte und systematischen Theologie*, Band 11) [1957]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich; Swiss Fr. 16·60.

The Early Church. The Swedish New Testament scholar, Bo Reicke, who now holds a Chair in Basel, has written an excellent commentary on the first seven chapters of the Acts,[2] as a study on the life and faith of the Early Church. Each paragraph of the text is followed by a careful study, in which the historical facts are examined and the contemporary theological background against which the account is to be set is described. Ac 2^{42}–4^{31} and Ac 4^{32}–5^{42} are held to be two parallel traditions of the conflict of the Early Church with the Sadducees. Professor Reicke is well acquainted with the work of other scholars on these chapters, but his book is no rehash of the views of others, but an original and stimulating study, which deserves careful reading.

Introduction to the Bible. The first volume of a large and important Catholic Introduction to the Bible, written in French and edited by the late

[2] *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde: Bemerkungen zu Apg. 1–7* (*Abhandlungen zur Theologie des A. und N. Testaments*, No. 32) [1957]. Zwingli Verlag, Basel; Swiss Fr. 14·50.

A. Robert and A. Feuillet, has made its appearance.[1] This volume is devoted to the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. The writers are all well-known scholars, and the work covers a much wider field than English works with a similar title. Inspiration, the principles of Biblical criticism, both textual and higher, and the framework of history into which the Bible must be set, all claim attention. Moreover, at a number of points attention is paid to Biblical theology. The order in which the books of the Bible are studied is original, in that it follows neither the Hebrew Canon nor the Vulgate. Broadly the order of the Hebrew Canon is followed for the Old Testament—the Law, the Prophets, the Writings. But the prophets are treated in chronological order, and not in the order in which they stand in any Bible. The Minor Prophets are thus distributed, and whereas Amos, Hosea, and Micah come before First Isaiah, Joel is placed in the post-exilic period and Deutero-Zechariah at the end of the section. It will thus be seen that in important respects the book is in line with the work of critical scholarship. Nevertheless the writers are cautious, and nowhere are extreme views embraced. On Ezekiel the view of Fohrer is followed, recognizing Ezekiel as a prophet of the sixth century, but finding various stages in the compilation of the book. Deutero-Isaiah is treated as a prophet of the Exile. Daniel stands amongst the writings, as in the Hebrew Canon, and the books of this section are studied in their Hebrew order. The apocryphal, or deutero-canonical, books are treated together, after the Hebrew Old Testament books. 1 and 2 Esdras do not figure here, however, though it may be presumed that 2 Esdras will have a place in the next volume, since it stands in the Vulgate as an appendix to the New Testament. There is a final section, dealing with the growth of the Canon of the Old Testament. Readers who would be aware of the changes which are taking place in Catholic Biblical scholarship should not miss this work.

Jerusalem and Rome. In a German series comparable with our ' Pelicans,' Professor Stauffer has a little book on Jerusalem and Rome,[2] which is packed with information. It covers the history of the Jews from the time of the Maccabees to the rebellion of Bar Cochba, with a brief account of the literature of Judaism and its sects during that period, including the Dead Sea Scrolls, to the study of which the author has elsewhere made important contributions. There are chapters on the Jewish sects, and especially on the Baptist movement, including, of course, John the Baptist. The growth of the Sanhedrin, apocalyptic, and liturgy all receive attention, and it is hard to see how more could have been included within the narrow compass of this book.

The Benedictine Vulgate. A new volume of the edition of the Vulgate, which has been so long in the course of preparation by the Benedictine monastery in Rome—which was established for the purpose of preparing this full critical edition—contains the text of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs.[3] All scholars who wish to use the readings of the Vulgate for text-critical purposes will want access to this edition, by reason of its elaborate critical apparatus, and when it is completed there will be no excuse for the uncritical use of Vulgate readings. It were much to be wished that we had similar tools for all the ancient versions. A beginning has been made with the Old Latin version, and the Cambridge and Göttingen Septuagints between them now cover a large part of the Old Testament. For the Syriac and the Targum we are less well provided, though an edition of the Syriac is in course of preparation. It will lack the rich resources that lie behind the Benedictine Vulgate, and the elaborate apparatus that makes this edition so valuable.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester

---

[1] *Introduction à la Bible*, i. [1957]. Desclée, Tournai and Paris ; Fr. 2200.

[2] *Jerusalem und Rom* [Dalp Taschenbücher ; 1957]. Francke Verlag, Bern ; Swiss Fr. 2·80.

[3] *Biblia sacra iuxta Latinam Vulgatam versionem ad codicum fidem iussu Pii PP. XII cura et studio monachorum . . . ordinis Sancti Benedicti edita, XI : Libri Salomonis, id est, Proverbia, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum* [1957]. Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, Romae.

Entre Nous

Sanguis est Semen

The Acts of the Apostles can never be a finished volume, but must always be a continued story. Another chapter in these Acts has been told by Elisabeth Elliot in *Through Gates of Splendour* (Hodder and Stoughton ; 16s. net). Few more thrilling missionary stories have ever been told ; and in this case the interest of the story is made many times more vivid by magnificent photographs of Cornell Capa.

In the early 1950's five young men, all connected with what are called Faith Missions, and their

wives, were converging on the missionary task in Ecuador.

There was Jim Elliot, honours student, champion wrestler, amateur poet, most popular of students and convinced Christian. In his diary, during his college days, he writes : ' " He makes His ministers a flame of fire." Am I ignitible ? God deliver me from the dread asbestos of " other things." Saturate me with the oil of the Spirit that I may be a flame.' He knew that he must go to Ecuador. ' I am as sure of His direction,' he said, ' as I am of His salvation.'

There was Peter Fleming, distinguished student in philosophy and literature, who might well have become a college professor if he had chosen the easy way.

There was Nate Saint, flying-mad from his boyhood, kept from a career in the Air Force by a recurrence of the osteomyelitis which had attacked him when he was a boy, distinguished as a ground engineer, and with a flair for all kinds of gadgets and inventions. His was the most interesting of all jobs. He became a pilot with the Missionary Aviation Fellowship, the MAF, and with the little yellow Piper aircraft, with its two-way wireless, was the greatest ally missionaries could have. Supplies could be flown in and journeys in the plane took as many minutes as they would have taken days on foot. Nate was a queer mixture. In one sense he was quite reckless. ' During the last war we were taught to recognize that, in order to obtain our objective, *we had to be willing to be expendable*. . . . Missionaries constantly face expendability.' Yet no man ever took greater care with his planning and his aircraft. ' Every time I take off, I am ready to deliver up the life I owe to God. I feel we should be quick to take advantage of every possible improvement in carrying out the job before us.' ' It is a very serious business, where you have to do your best possible calculating and double checking on everything, and then trusting the Lord—go in and do your duty.' He had the caution of the expert, and the recklessness of the disciple. ' I don't expect ever to be a preacher,' he said, ' but some day I would like to talk to some one who has never heard about Jesus.'

There was Ed McCully, six feet two, one hundred and ninety pounds of him. He was an athlete of the most extraordinary determination. His coach said : ' He was always coming through with the impossible when the chips were down.' He set out to study business and economics, and on the very night before he was due to start on his law course, he felt the unmistakable call to be a missionary. ' It's kind of like putting all your eggs in one basket, but we've already put our trust in Him for salvation, so why not do it as far as our life is concerned ? '

There was Roger Youderian, the victim of polio, yet a decorated paratrooper at the Battle of the Bulge in 1944.

These young men and their wives worked amongst the Jivaros and the Quichuas ; but one tribe haunted them. That tribe was the Aucas, a primitive tribe of killers, their ferocity increased by the reckless brutality of the rubber traders between 1875 and 1925, a tribe absolutely untouched by any word from Christ.

They laid their plans. Everything was done. By use of the Piper aircraft they established some kind of contact with the Aucas. They learned some few phrases : ' I like you ! I am your friend ! I like you ! ' These phrases they shouted down by loud-speaker. They developed a clever system of dropping the Aucas gifts from the aeroplane at the end of a spiral line. They even got the length of having the Aucas send them up gifts at the end of the line by which their gifts were dropped. They never forgot that the Aucas were killers.

Finally they thought that all their preparations were made as far as they possibly could be made. Then they dropped in on a strip of sand and waited for the Aucas to come. They were able to communicate with their headquarters with their two-way wireless set. But there was a silence. What happened no one will ever know ; but when a rescue party was flown in all that was left was the dead bodies of these five gallant adventurers for Christ.

This book was written by Elisabeth Elliot, the wife of Jim Elliot, with the help of the other four young widows. She is still there in Ecuador carrying on the work her husband began. Barbara Youderian writes : ' I want to be free of self-pity. It is a tool of Satan to rot away a life. . . . The Lord has closed our hearts to grief and hysteria, and filled in with His perfect peace.'

The strange thing about this book is that it ought to read as a tragedy, humanly speaking, and somehow it reads as a triumph. No one will read this book without a catch in the throat. Apart from anything else, it is one of the great dramatic adventure stories of all time. This is a book to let all men see what the Spirit of Christ can do with men, when men surrender themselves wholly to that Spirit. And the heroism of the young widows who are left is even greater than the heroism of the young men who died, for it is the greatest of all heroisms, the heroism of going on.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.